



Learn and Serve America Meth Free TN: Youth Edition

Evaluation Report #1

August 1, 2006—June 30, 2007

Prepared by:

The Institute for Assessment and Evaluation
College of Education, Health and Human Sciences
The University of Tennessee
July 2007
Report 07-06

The Institute for Assessment and Evaluation
College of Education, Health and Human Sciences
The University of Tennessee
July 2007
Report 07-06

Contributors to This Study

Data collection, analysis, and report preparation have been conducted by the following team members:

Evaluation Team

Dr. Gary Skolits, Director

Dr. Judy Boser, Senior Research Associate

Dr. Stephanie Robinson, Senior Research Associate

Graduate Students

Carol Price, Graduate Research Assistant

Institute for Assessment and Evaluation
College of Education, Health and Human Sciences
University of Tennessee
1122 Volunteer Blvd
Janet and David Bailey Education Complex 513
Knoxville, TN 37996-3456
(865) 974-6800

Preface

The University of Tennessee's Institute for Assessment and Evaluation (IAE) has been contracted to provide ongoing annual evaluation of Learn and Serve America (LSA) Meth Free TN: Youth Edition (also referred to as Afterschool Service-Learning) over the life of the grant program. Learn and Serve America Meth Free TN: Youth Edition is a statewide grant program that supports integration of service-learning in afterschool programs to further statewide methamphetamine (meth) prevention initiatives by creating anti-meth communication products by youth for youth. In this first annual evaluation report, the Institute for Assessment and Evaluation team presents its findings and conclusions regarding Afterschool Service-Learning progress as of June 2007 (the end of the project reporting year August 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007). This report provides a formative evaluation perspective. Accordingly, the evaluation provides findings, conclusions, and recommendations for consideration by the State Program Coordinator and staff.

For the Afterschool Service-Learning Program, the evaluation team prepared one evaluation report addressing state level progress with input and data from the participating Afterschool Service-Learning Programs. The 17 organizations receive direct assistance in developing and implementing localized initiatives that address local needs within the scope (and associated guidelines) of the statewide grant.

Table of Contents

CONTENTS	PAGE
Preface	i
Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction	5
II. Data Collection Methods	5
III. Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	7
▪ Question One	11
▪ Question Two	20
▪ Question Three	22
▪ Question Four	23
▪ Question Five	27
IV. Conclusions and Recommendations	29
Appendices	33
Appendix A. Learn and Serve America Resilience Student Surveys: Grades 3-5, Grades 6-12/Pre, and Grades 6-12/Post	
Appendix B. LASSIE Data on Agencies and Participants	
Appendix C. Examples of Anti-Meth Communication Products by Agency	
Appendix D. Learn and Serve America Resilience Student Survey Results	
Appendix E. Community Partners	
Appendix F. Application and Expansion Requests	
Appendix G. Example of Procedures for Collecting Beneficiary Data	
Appendix H. Training Institute and Symposium Agendas	
Appendix I. Service-Learning Training Institute and Symposium Evaluation Summaries	

Executive Summary

This report is the first of three annual evaluation reports to be prepared by the Institute for Assessment and Evaluation (IAE) on the Learn and Serve America Meth Free TN: Youth Edition program (also referred to as Afterschool Service-Learning). There will be three annual evaluations: two formative and one summative. The Corporation for National and Community Service awarded the Afterschool Service-Learning grant to Volunteer Tennessee in the fall of 2006. The community-based Learn and Serve America Meth Free TN: Youth Edition is a statewide grant program that supports integration of service-learning in afterschool programs to further statewide methamphetamine (meth) prevention initiatives by creating anti-meth communication products by youth for youth. Grant-sponsored activities in the participating Afterschool Service-Learning Programs began in fall 2006. This first evaluation report addresses project activities and accomplishments from August 2006 to June 2007. It documents the Afterschool Service-Learning Program activities and results during the first year of implementation. The impact of these program activities has been included as part of the evaluation team's response to each evaluation question.

A complete list of the evaluation team's conclusions and recommendations follows. Each of these conclusions and recommendations is introduced and addressed under the appropriate evaluation question in the body of the full report.

Conclusions of the Study

1. The Afterschool Service-Learning Program was designed to serve up to 22 afterschool programs; 17 subgrants were actually awarded for the program. Two agencies administer multiple programs; thus, 17 agencies represent 20 afterschool programs.
2. The Afterschool Service-Learning Program is fully operational through 17 agencies representing 20 participating afterschool organizations. These include agencies in the following counties: Bradley, Cannon, Carroll, Crockett, Franklin, Gibson, Grundy, Hamblen, Knox, Loudon, Madison, McMinn, McNairy, Montgomery, Putnam, Smith, and Sullivan.
3. The Afterschool Service-Learning Program provides services through the delegation of responsibilities to participating agencies subject to the provisions in the proposals for the subgrants.
4. Despite the statewide perspective of the program, the program is led and coordinated by a single State Program Coordinator and an Agency Program Coordinator in each of the 17 participating organizations.
5. Statewide performance measures have been established in three categories: Participant Development, Strengthening Communities, and Needs and Activities.
6. It is too early in the project to determine the full extent to which the project is achieving stated goals. Substantive progress has been made toward all performance measures.
7. Participant Development outputs and outcomes include developing skills in problem solving by participation in service-learning projects, and increased resiliency. The number of participants exceeded the performance output projected for one year.

Examples of problem solving and resiliency were seen in anti-meth communication products and service-learning activities. Increase in problem solving skills for participants was also shown by self-report items for students in grades 6-12 on posttest surveys.

8. Learn and Serve America Resiliency Student surveys were given to many participants both as a pre- and post-test. Different surveys were used by one organization, and another organization used the pre-survey for grades 6-12 after the activities instead of the post-survey, which had additional items. Use of survey data was limited due to inconsistent administration of the same survey, and variable numbers of participants completing both surveys.
9. The performance output of Strengthening Communities was also exceeded by creating and documenting partnerships that reported increased capacity to provide services as a result of the Afterschool Service-Learning involvement.
10. The focus of Needs and Activities was the anti-meth communication resources and products. Each Afterschool Service-Learning program produced at least one product related to meth and provided information to at least one community audience. Responses from readers/hearers were primarily informal and anecdotal in nature.
11. The content of the anti-meth communication products reflects participants' positive attitudes and knowledge about the use of meth.
12. Responses from readers/hearers of the anti-meth products were primarily informal in nature.
13. Participants' constructive attitudes, knowledge and behaviors regarding service-learning and the community were seen in activities and survey responses.
14. Beneficiaries of the service-learning activities provided positive, but anecdotal, reactions.
15. Agency Program Coordinators expressed positive attitudes toward the project, perceiving many potential benefits to their organizations, participants, and communities.
16. All organizations requested continuance funds, and a majority requested expansion funds.
17. All organizations created and documented at least one partnership that reported increased capacity to provide services as a result of the Afterschool Service-Learning involvement.
18. At this early stage of the project, data have not been solicited from community partners.
19. Few project implementation problems have been encountered during the first project year.
20. Some concerns were expressed by individual community-based agencies that could be applicable state-wide: age appropriate resources for activities and assessments, training on matching funds, assessment of knowledge of meth dangers and prevention, and issues of legalities regarding drug usage.
21. The implementation activities have been perceived positively, including communications from the State Program Coordinator, training/sharing opportunities, and resources.

22. Individual agencies reported a variety of technical strengths and needs, with the area of reflection techniques being the greatest need. The State Program Coordinator recognizes a need for training on developing community resources.
23. Pre- and post-survey comparison data represented only about 20% of participants. Responses of unrepresented participants may have differed from those completing both surveys and been sufficiently numerous to change the survey results that are represented in this report.
24. The majority of agencies have plans to identify and involve a comparison group, but some still need assistance with this process.
25. It is early in the life of the project; therefore, long-term sustainability of the project cannot yet be assessed.
26. Some potential signs of project sustainability are evident at the agency level relating to the four strategies that promote sustainability (Brantley, 2004): Implementation, Partnerships, Resource Development, and Media Management.

Recommendations

1. State Program Coordinator efforts to enhance project implementation for 2007-2008 are already underway and should continue to be implemented. The commitment to continuous improvement is noted by the evaluation team, and these efforts will prove to be valuable over time.
2. Since the Afterschool Service-Learning Program was designed to serve up to 22 programs, and only 20 programs were implemented in 2006-2007, implementation of additional programs should be a focus for upcoming years. Certificates of recognition would provide an appropriate award for individual participants.
3. The basic project model for service planning and delivery is commendable in that it empowers local communities to define their needs and propose strategies within the scope of the project. Continuous training will be necessary to ensure that local agencies have the knowledge and skills needed to maximize efforts and enhance student service-learning experiences.
4. State and agency program staff members have recently engaged in the reapplication and expansion process for the subgrants. New and renewed subgrants should be awarded soon.
5. The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should develop procedures for administration of pre- and post-surveys. This would include timeframe for administering surveys to participants and comparison groups, which surveys to use, and consistency in participant involvement at both pre- and post-administration.
6. The State Program Coordinator should review the use of the resiliency instrument to determine its applicability to the performance measure of Participant Development. A way to assess problem solving skills for grades 3-5, in addition to product examples, should be incorporated.

7. The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should develop procedures for collecting data related to the readers/hearers of the anti-meth communication products.
8. The State Program Coordinator should review the use of the resiliency instrument, or some other data collection strategy, to determine its applicability to determining program impact on participants' attitudes, knowledge, and/or behaviors regarding meth and service-learning.
9. Procedures for collecting data from the beneficiaries of the service-learning activities and to the readers/hearers of the anti-meth communication products should be developed and implemented in all organizations consistently. An example can be seen in Appendix G.
10. The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should design data collection processes for community partners to address this evaluation.
11. The State Program Coordinator should continue to provide training, with additional focus on age appropriate resources for activities and assessments, matching funds, assessment of knowledge of meth dangers and prevention, issues of legalities regarding drug usage, reflection strategies, and developing community resources.
12. Procedures for administration of pre- and post-surveys should be developed more completely and implemented in all organizations consistently, with a focus on strategies to increase participant completion of both the pre- and post-survey to determine participant changes.
13. The State Program Coordinator should review the use of the resiliency instrument to determine its applicability to the performance measures of Participant Development and Needs and Activities, focusing on the impact of activities regarding the use and prevention of meth.
14. The State Program Coordinator should provide assistance to all agencies regarding the determination of comparison group, and develop procedures for involvement of the comparison groups in assessment activities.
15. As the project proceeds to years two and three, systematic sustainability planning should be addressed at the state and agency level. State provided training should focus on developing community resources.
16. The State Program Coordinator should promote, be alert to, recognize and document evidence of sustainability to the extent possible each year of the project.

I. Introduction

This evaluation report and subsequent annual evaluation reports for the Afterschool Service-Learning Program will be organized around a core of five evaluation questions developed by the evaluation team and agreed upon by the State Program Coordinator:

1. To what extent are the outputs and outcomes of the program being accomplished?
2. How is the program impacting participants' and beneficiaries' attitudes, knowledge and/or behaviors?
3. How is the project affecting community partners?
4. What problems in project implementation have emerged? How have they been resolved?
5. How is sustainability of key components of the project being addressed?

There will be three annual evaluations: two formative and one summative. Findings of the evaluation study are organized by study question. None of the evaluation questions can be answered definitively at this early stage of the project. The first evaluation will be an abbreviated report due to the early timeframe of the project, the short term involvement of the evaluation team, and limited data availability. The impacts of the Afterschool Service-Learning project on participants, beneficiaries and other constituencies will be cumulative over the duration of the grant, and many outcomes will not be evident until the later years in the project. Each of the evaluation team's annual reports will represent another step toward identifying the project's ultimate accomplishments and outcomes.

II. Data Collection Sources and Methods

This report uses multiple data collection sources to generate answers to the evaluation study questions. These sources include:

1. Surveys of Afterschool Service-Learning Program Participants;
2. Interview of State Afterschool Service-Learning State Program Coordinator;
3. Interviews of Afterschool Service-Learning Agency Program Coordinators;
4. Afterschool Service-Learning Program Products, Reports and Other Artifacts;
5. Observations of Afterschool Service-Learning Program Training Sessions and Site Visits.

1. Surveys of Afterschool Service-Learning Program Participants

The evaluation team collected data from two surveys of Afterschool Service-Learning Program participants from the Afterschool Service-Learning State Program Coordinator. The first survey was conducted from November 2006 through January 2007 to capture baseline data (i.e., prior to substantive project implementation). The second survey was conducted in late May through June 2007 to ensure that annual progress results were available for the Afterschool Service-Learning Program evaluation report. No single date was mandated for administration of either survey; thus, surveys were administered by Agency Program Coordinators at the

individual sites at different times. At some sites, multiple administration dates were reported in an effort to include absentees.

Given the timing of survey administrations, survey participant responses for the 2007 semester do not reflect experiences or perceptions over the entire program year, or upcoming summer 2007 activities. Some major program activities scheduled as part of the 2007 program semester were not completed when the surveys were conducted. Comparative data showing possible participant changes were available only for those who completed both surveys: 48 in grades 3-5 and 74 in grades 6-12. While other participants may have been involved throughout the program, their completion of both pre- and post-surveys was required for inclusion in the comparisons. Responses from unrepresented participants may have differed from those completing both surveys and been sufficiently numerous to change the survey results that are presented in this report. The Resilience Learn and Serve Student Survey (Appendix A) was selected for both survey administrations. The instrument consists of eight four-point Likert items for students in grades 3-5 and 17 similar items for students in grades 6-12. One local group used another instrument by mistake.

The post-test version of the grades 6-12 survey had two additional pages not found on the pretest. One page asked participants to rate their skills in 10 areas as they might have done prior to the program, then to rate them as they were at the conclusion of the program. While not necessarily a solid measure of participants' perceptions at the beginning of the program, this approach did give participants an opportunity to report current perceptions and to indicate perceived improvement by the way in they chose to rate their skills "before" the program. Skills were rated as "Not good at all," "Fairly good," "Very good," or "Excellent."

The final page of the posttest asked seven questions about the participants' activities and perceptions of the project and its impact.

2. Interview of State Afterschool Service-Learning State Program Coordinator

A member of the IAE evaluation team conducted an interview of Afterschool Service-Learning Program state level program leadership during early July 2007 to have results available for the annual Afterschool Service-Learning Program evaluation report. While program leaders are often too close to their own project to be fully objective, the State Program Coordinator appeared to speak frankly about the project, experiences, and perceptions of associated strengths and challenges.

3. Interviews of Afterschool Service-Learning Agency Program Coordinators

IAE evaluation team members conducted telephone interviews with 16 of the 17 Agency Program Coordinators of the community-based organizations during June and early July 2007 in order to have results available for the annual evaluation report.

4. Afterschool Service-Learning Program Products, Reports and Other Artifacts

The Afterschool Service-Learning Program staff, at the state and project levels, supplied program reports, communication products, data summaries, field logs and other artifacts related to the project, its implementation, and initial outcomes. These materials were made available to the evaluation team. In spring 2007 many of these documents reflected implementation plans, and other documents focused on the start-up and early implementation efforts of the project. Formal program reports are required from all sub-grantees through LASSIE, an online reporting

system for all grantees for Learn and Serve America. Data from the LASSIE reports were made available to the evaluation team. Data includes information on participants, state and agency program coordinators/staff and volunteers, service-learning/participant experience, community/program partners, program characteristics, institutional support, outcomes, program description, and technical strengths and needs.

5. Observations of Afterschool Service-Learning Program Training Sessions and Site Visits

Although the evaluation team became involved in the Afterschool Service-Learning Program late in the program year, members of the evaluation team were able to attend the spring statewide symposium in May 2007 and to observe several site events during June and early July 2007.

III. Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The evaluation team has organized the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this study by the evaluation questions previously introduced. These will be addressed following a description of the Afterschool Service-Learning Program.

This section begins with an overview of the organization of the program delivery system and a brief review of activities and products during 2007 across and within the participating projects. This discussion will include reporting years/project years, agencies/participants, program staffing, implementation design, performance measures and the actual implementation of interventions.

Afterschool Service-Learning Program Reporting Years: The Afterschool Service-Learning Program has been funded for the following project years:

2006-2007	Year 1
2007-2008	Year 2
2008-2009	Year 3

The emphasis during 2006-2007 focused on securing program staff, developing related program infrastructure and support systems, awarding subgrants to individual projects as well as planning for project implementation and evaluation.

Learn and Serve America Meth Free TN: Youth Edition is a statewide grant program that supports integration of service-learning in afterschool programs to further statewide methamphetamine (meth) prevention initiatives by creating anti-meth communication products by youth for youth. Sub-grants of up to \$10,000 a year for the next three years are awarded based upon performance and availability of federal appropriations. The calendar for the first year can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. *Meth Free TN: Youth Edition - Year 1 Timeline*

November 14-15, 2006	Afterschool Service-Learning Institute
Before January 15, 2007	Distribute pre tests to service-learning participants. Mail to Kimee Schideler at Volunteer Tennessee.
January 2007	Programs participate in MLK Day of Service activities.
May 10-11, 2007	Afterschool Service-Learning Symposium, Nashville
Spring/Summer 2007	Site Visits
Before June 30, 2007	Participants produce and disseminate anti-meth communication product
Before June 30, 2007	Post tests distributed to service-learning participants. participants. Mail them to evaluator.
June 30, 2007	Deadline for submitting online LASSIE report to Corporation.
June 30, 2007	Signed community partner MOU form due to Kimee Shideler at Volunteer Tennessee.

Afterschool Service-Learning Programs: The Afterschool Service-Learning Program was designed to serve up to 22 afterschool programs; 17 subgrants were initially awarded for the program. The programs are serving participants in afterschool programs within the following counties: Bradley, Cannon, Carroll, Crockett, Franklin, Gibson, Grundy, Hamblen, Knox, Loudon, Madison, McMinn, McNairy, Montgomery, Putnam, Smith, and Sullivan. Grants of \$10,000 were awarded to all except two who represent multiple awards: Sonshine Avenue Ministry received \$20,000 (two programs) and Tennessee Tech University – Upper Cumberland Child Care Resource & Referral (TTU/CCR&R) received \$30,000 for three programs. Thus, 17 agencies represent 20 afterchool programs. Fourteen of the seventeen agencies report through LASSIE that this is the first LSA grant that the organization has received. The Afterschool Service-Learning Program is administered to K-12 students through the following afterschool programs:

- Bells City School
- Boys & Girls Clubs of TN- Valley- Loudon County
- Boys & Girls Clubs of TN- Valley- Vestal
- Break the Cycle, Inc
- Cannon County REACH Program
- First Missionary Baptist Church
- Franklin County Schools
- Jaguar Learning Academy Northeast Middle School
- Little Children of the World, Inc. – Camp Etowah
- McNairy School District
- Sonshine Avenue Ministry
- South Carroll Special School District (Clarksburg School)
- TN's Community Assistance Corp. (TCAC)
- Tennessee Tech University – Upper Cumberland Child Care Resource & Referral (TTU/CCR&R)
- Tracy City Elementary
- Trenton Housing Authority
- YWCA of Bristol

Agency Program Coordinators facilitate service-learning activities with K-12 grade students, with a focus on anti-meth information and resources. LASSIE reporting also indicated the level of experience of the organizations with service-learning, with a majority (11) having less than a year experience, five having two to five years, and only one with six or more years experience. (Appendix B provides additional LASSIE data on programs and participants.) Each year programs develop at least one community partnership in support of service-learning.

Each program engages at least 30 participants (ages 5 – 17) in service-learning activities for a minimum of 20 hours per semester. Service-learning is defined by the Corporation for National and Community Service as a method by which students improve academic learning and develop personal skills through structured service projects that meet community needs. In addition, participants in Afterschool Service-Learning programs create at least one peer meth prevention communication product annually to be disseminated to local schools and/or youth serving organizations.

According to the State Program Coordinator, *“The Afterschool program directly ties into the goals and objectives of the LEAP and 21st Century (Tennessee 21st Century Community Learning Centers - 21st CCLC) programs. We seek to link our Afterschool program to these two other programs, that’s why we sought targeted sites that were involved in LEAPs and 21st Century for our programs.”* LEAP, or Lottery for Education: Afterschool Programs, provides students with academic enrichment opportunities that reinforce and complement the regular academic program. Similarly, Tennessee 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) focus on academic enrichment activities to help students meet state and local standards. Of the 17 organizations, 9 are LEAP sites and 6 are 21st CCLCs. In addition there are connections with AmeriCorps, VISTA, and Aspire programs.

Program Staffing: The state level Afterschool Service-Learning grant is administered by an Afterschool Service-Learning State Program Coordinator for Volunteer Tennessee. Each community-based program is directed by an Agency Program Coordinator. Some have additional site personnel or support staff, depending on the scope and existence of the afterschool program beyond the LSA grant and activities. LASSIE reports indicate that the average number of staff is 11, with an average of 10 youth leaders/volunteers, and 24 adult leaders/volunteers. (Appendix B provides LASSIE data on programs and participants.)

Implementation Design: The Afterschool Service-Learning Program implementation design can be seen through a description of program requirements and expectations provided by the State Program Coordinator, as described in Table 2 and under the next two headings, training and partnerships.

Table 2. Program Requirements and Expectations

- Program Coordinators must:
 - attend 2 state-wide service-learning trainings annually.
 - engage 30 participants (ages 5 – 17) in service-learning activities for a minimum of 20 hrs/semester.
 - facilitate the service-learning cycle of preparation, action, reflection, and celebration/demonstration, including strong youth voice throughout the process.
 - Program participants must create one peer to peer meth prevention communication product each year to be disseminated to local schools and/or youth serving organizations. (Requirements for publications included in contract under Standard Terms and Conditions and LSA Provisions).
 - Programs must:
 - participate in a Martin Luther King, Jr. Day of Service event.
 - involve 20 adult volunteers in their service-learning projects annually.
 - avoid prohibited activities (included in contract under LSA provisions).
 - submit LASSIE reports to the Corporation and progress report information to Volunteer TN as requested by deadline.
 - participate in programmatic site visits (Up to 3).
 - participate in program evaluation by distributing pre and post tests and identifying a comparison group.
-

Training: Volunteer TN provides two state-wide service-learning trainings annually for program staff, replicating effective training strategies from past Learn and Serve America programs, Lions-Quest, and the Aspire Youth Leadership Program. The fall Afterschool Service-Learning Grantee Meeting was held in Nashville on November 14-15, 2006. The spring Symposium was held on May 10-11, 2007, also in Nashville. In addition to training for adults, Afterschool programs are offered the chance to send a team of 8-10 students for service-learning, leadership, and youth voice development training through the state Aspire program.

Partnerships: A major role of the subgrantee grant administrators will be to secure Memoranda of Agreement with community partners and to nurture the relationships between the Afterschool programs and these community partners. By the end of year three, each program will have secured and documented at least three Afterschool-community partnerships.

Performance Measurements: Statewide performance measures have been established for the 2006-2009 Afterschool Service-Learning Program in three categories: Participant Development, Strengthening Communities, and Needs and Activities. These can be seen in Table 3. Each category describes performance output, intermediate outcome, and end outcome. The extent to which these outputs and outcomes are being accomplished will be addressed in detail by performance measurement category below. Performance measure figures were based upon subgrant awards to 22 agencies although only 20 were actually awarded through 17 agencies.

Table 3. *Tennessee Statewide Performance measures for 2006-09 LSA Afterschool/Meth Free TN: Youth Edition Grant*

Participant Development
1,980 K-12 students will report increased problem solving skills that support them in reducing risky behaviors.
<i>Output:</i> By the end of year three, 1,980 K-12 students will participate in service-learning projects.
<i>Intermediate outcome:</i> 70% of K-12 students participating in service-learning activities will report increased problem solving, as measured by a survey
<i>End outcome:</i> 85% of service-learning participants will increase their resiliency.
Strengthening Communities
Each year, 85% of 22 new afterschool program-community partners will report an increased capacity to provide services as a result of student involvement.
<i>Output:</i> By the end of year three, 66 new afterschool-community partnerships will be created and documented.
<i>Intermediate outcome:</i> By the end of year three, 85% of community partners will report an increased capacity to provide services as a result of afterschool student involvement.
<i>End outcome:</i> By the end of year three, 70 community partnerships with afterschool programs are established supporting service-learning strategies beyond the Learn and Serve America grant.
Needs and Activities
After three years, all of the 66 anti-meth communication resources will be generated by afterschool participants, resulting in negative attitudes toward meth among 90% of K-12 students who see the anti-meth messages contributing to a reduction in the percentage of TN teens lifetime use.
<i>Output:</i> By the end of year three, 66 anti-meth communication products will be developed and distributed.
<i>Intermediate outcome:</i> By the end of year three, 90% of readers/hearers of the anti-meth communication products will indicate that they are less likely to use meth or confirmed in their opposition to meth as a result of one of the products.
<i>End outcome:</i> The percentage of TN teen lifetime meth use will decline by 1%.

Evaluation Question One: *To what extent are the outputs and outcomes of the program being accomplished?*

The evaluation team will use the performance measures as described above as the basis for examining the progress to date of the Afterschool Service-Learning Program.

Participant Development: 1,980 K-12 students will report increased problem solving skills that support them in reducing risky behaviors.

Output: By the end of year three, 1,980 K-12 students will participate in service-learning projects.

Based upon the three-year projection of 30 students per program per year, during year one 600 participants should have been involved in activities. Although most service-learning activities in the Afterschool programs began in January, based upon LASSIE reporting data, 997 K-12 students have participated in service-learning activities within the 20 Afterschool programs. Thus, the performance measure was exceeded by half again in this first semester of implementation. In addition there have been 186 faculty/staff participants, and 584 youth and adult volunteers involved with the participants in these activities. Over two thirds of the participants were in grades 4 – 8 (673 out of 997 or 67.5%). A similar number were white (601 or 69%), with a quarter being black (262) and less than 10% Hispanic (63). There were about equal numbers of males and females, 490 and 507 respectively. Appendix B includes tables

from LASSIE data that provide detailed information on participants in the 20 Afterschool programs, including grade levels and demographic information.

LASSIE data also reveals that average service hours per participant ranged from 1 to 25 hours depending on the organization. Several service-learning projects involved senior citizens: making and delivering cooking safety baskets, gardening at senior centers, making cards, and having dances. Others helped the communities in which they reside, such as picking up trash on the town streets or planning and participating in a block party for neighborhood families. An evaluation team member observed the block party in which 10-12 Afterschool Service-Learning participants wearing their anti-meth t-shirts shared anti-meth brochures and trinkets with attendees. When they weren't at the Afterschool Service-Learning table, participants were assisting children in the neighborhood with various fun activities.

Intermediate outcome: 70% of K-12 students participating in service-learning activities will report increased problem solving, as measured by a survey.

As indicated on the website for the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, one of the characteristics of authentic service-learning experiences (Eyler and Giles, 1999) is that they “offer opportunities to engage in problem-solving by requiring participants to gain knowledge of the specific context of their service-learning activity and community challenges,” and that they offer “opportunities to acquire the habits of critical thinking; i.e. the ability to identify the most important questions or issues within a real-world situation.”

http://www.servicelearning.org/welcome_to_service-learning/service-learning_is/index.php

Definitions of problem solving often include stages or skills required for problem solving. These include the ability to plan, to identify relevant information, practical application of reasoning and critical thinking, organizing and communicating relevant information, creating and implementing strategies to overcome cognitive and social problems, and create processes that continuously look at the problem and solutions over time.

Each Afterschool program produced at least one communication product related to meth and provided that information to at least one community audience. In doing such, program participants demonstrated the characteristics of problem solving by planning, design, creating and promoting the anti-meth product. Fourth and fifth graders in one Afterschool program created a PowerPoint presentation of ‘healthy choices’ as alternatives to meth use. Several groups researched and designed brochures and flyers with the dangers of the use of meth. Other information provided included ways to say no, who to talk to, community resources, and the effects of the drug on the individual and on family relationships. In each case, the participants researched, designed and created the products. Other examples can be seen in Appendix C.

Surveys of participants also provide some information related to problem solving skills. (Detailed survey results can be found in Appendix D.) As previously described, the posttest version of the grades 6-12 survey had two additional pages not found on the pretest. Data from these pages apply to problem solving skills. Student in grades 6-12 completed self ratings of their skills at the conclusion of the project on the survey instrument. At that time they were also asked to rate how their skills were at the beginning of the project. Comparisons were made only for students who had completed pretests and posttests since they participated throughout the project. As seen in Table 4, while not every participant improved in every area, the vast majority (84%) who had ratings that could be improved did show improvement in one or more areas on the posttest.

Table 4. *Comparison of student self ratings*

	N	%
Students perceiving themselves as improving in one or more areas on posttest	52	83.9
Students rating themselves as "Excellent" in all areas on both pretest and posttest (no room for improvement)	2	3.2
Students whose scores did not change from pretest to posttest and were not all "Excellent"	6	9.7
Students who did not show improvement in any areas and showed decline in one or more areas on the posttest	2	3.2

The percentage of students who gave themselves higher ratings on the posttest than the pretest varied from 39% to 54% on individual items, as shown below, with an overall average of 46%. Table 5 shows the numbers of before and after ratings on this particular item set. In total, the posttest showed 155 (25.3%) "Excellent" ratings, 261 (42.6%) "Very good" ratings, 159 (25.9%) "Fairly good" ratings, and only 38 (6.2%) ratings of "Not good at all." Given the students' indications of change, these items seem particularly suited to this project, in that they are related to problem solving, resilience, and what is actually occurring in the project. There are no comparable survey items on the form for grades 3-5, and project staff may be in a position to determine which, if any, of these items are applicable at that level.

Table 5. *Project Related Skills*

	N	Posttest Higher	Pretest Ceiling*
a. Finding resources for a community project.	61	33 54.1%	6 9.8%
b. Leading a group project.	62	31 50.0%	10 16.1%
c. Understanding what other people are trying to say	60	31 51.7%	11 18.3%
d. Getting others to listen to my ideas	62	26 41.9%	8 12.9%
e. Speaking in front of groups of people	59	27 45.8%	4 6.8%
f. Predicting the consequences of actions	62	28 45.2%	8 12.9%
g. Finding information to solve problems	61	25 41.0%	7 11.5%
h. Writing	62	24 38.7%	8 12.9%
i. Doing research on problems in the community	62	26 41.9%	7 11.3%
j. Helping other students to resolve their conflicts.	62	29 46.8%	6 9.7%
Total	613	280 45.7%	75 12.2%

* Pretest scores of 4 remained at 4 on posttest, not permitting improved ratings.

End outcome: 85% of service-learning participants will increase their resiliency.

In a generic sense, resilience refers to the ability to recover. In relationship to issues surrounding children and youth, it often refers to the individual's response to risk factors based upon protective factors or processes that fosters the ability to recover.

<http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/leadrs/le0win.htm> Winfield, L. *NCREL Monograph: Developing resilience in urban youth*. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory's Urban Education Program, 1994. Initial research on resilience was based on information provided by the Corporation for National and Community Service, Quick Guide: Resilience. All information in this section is based upon references from that website. http://www.servicelearning.org/resources/quick_guides/resilience/. The operational definition of resilience that will be used in the evaluation process for this report will be based on characteristics of resilient survivors and the protective processes that enable individuals to develop resilience (Benard). <http://www.resiliency.com/index.htm>. In addition to problem solving, previously discussed, the characteristics that will indicate resilience will be social competence and caring relationships, autonomy and high expectations, and sense of purpose and opportunities for meaningful participation. As described by Benard and supplemented by Winfield, these include specific attributes as listed below. They also related to the 7 resiliencies outlined by Wolin and Wolin. <http://projectresilience.com/index.htm>

Definitional criteria for Resilience	Benard's description and Winfield's related factors	Wolin and Wolin's 7 Resiliencies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Competence developed through caring relationships 	Compassion, caring, respect, communication skills, connections, positive interactions, social responsiveness and sensitivity	Sense of humor Relationships
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomy developed through high expectation messages 	Sense of identity, self-esteem, self-efficacy, strengths, decision-making, self-control	Insight Independence Initiative Morality
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of purpose and future through opportunities for meaningful participation 	Goals, aspirations, spiritual connectedness, valued responsibilities, voice, contributing one's talents to the community, impact others, accomplishment of tasks	Creativity

Products created by participants in the Afterschool programs demonstrate the abilities and characteristics related to the criteria above. By planning, creating, and promoting the anti-meth products, participants exhibited the criteria of social competence and caring relationships which demonstrates communication skills, interactions with adults and peers, social sensitivity, and connections to the community. Autonomy was demonstrated through decision making, belief in self control and sense of identity. Contributing to the well being of the community, completing the task of making the product, and being responsive to community needs indicated the participant's sense of purpose and meaningful involvement with others.

Participants in one program elected to assemble backpacks for children involved in drug related police raids. According to a LASSIE report, the participants "asked the mayor to request that police carry the backpacks in every raid so kids in the home would have something to carry with them when they are removed from the home. Learn and Serve students stuffed and tagged each backpack." The students determined the items needed and solicited donations for the items. Appendix C lists some examples of communication products created by the community-based Afterschool participants.

Participation within the community in service-learning projects, during Martin Luther King, Jr. Day of Service events and continuing throughout the semester, also demonstrated similar characteristics and opportunities to develop resilient behaviors and beliefs. Posters, quilts, and presentations on diversity and "dreams" were some of the projects related to the MLK celebrations.

Survey data offer some evidence of increased resiliency in participants. Although Learn and Serve America Resiliency Student surveys were given to many participants both as a pre-

and post-test, different surveys were used by one organization, and another organization used the pre-survey for grades 6-12 after the activities instead of the post-survey, which had additional items. Forty-eight students, however, completed both the pretest and posttest of the Resilience Learn and Serve student survey for grades 3-5. Only those 48 sets of paired data are used for comparing pretest and posttest results because other students completing only one of the two surveys might not have participated the full duration of the project. Only forms with signed assent forms that were attached so that pretest and posttest could be matched were used.

The Resilience Survey for grades 3-5 had nine items, the first of which served as an example. Of the remaining eight items, five relate to activities and circumstances at school. They include:

- 3. I like being at school
- 4. I feel safe in school
- 5. At school, I help decide things like class activities or rules.
- 6. The work I do at school is interesting.
- 9. At least one teacher or other adult at my school really cares about me.

The Tennessee project is an after school project, administered primarily by non-school agencies. There is no control over what happens at school, nor is there any implicit connection between the project and teaching staff. While Question 5 could be interpreted as a sign of resilience, whether or not there is an opportunity for students to participate in decision-making at school is beyond the scope of the project.

As seen in Table 6, the remaining three items showed varying results.

Table 6. *Applicable Items Grades 3-5.*

	N	Posttest Higher		Pretest Ceiling*	
2. I can make a difference in my neighborhood or town.	48	19	39.6%	5	10.4%
7. I stand up for myself without putting others down.	48	10	20.8%	6	12.5%
8. I am good at leading a group project.	48	10	20.8%	5	10.4%

*Participant pretest rating of Strongly Agree (highest rating) was unchanged on posttest, but there was no opportunity for a higher rating.

Comparison of ratings for all items showed some positive movement even on items that were school related (Table 7).

Table 7. *Comparison of student self ratings*

	N	%
Students showing movement from strongly disagree toward strongly agree on one or more items on posttest (items 2 through 8)	39	81.3%
Students showing movement from strongly disagree toward strongly agree on one or more items on posttest (items 2, 7, 8)	25	52.1%

The Resilience survey for students in grades 6-12 also included number of school-related items:

- a. At least one teacher or other adult at school believes I will be a success.
- b. The school work I am assigned is meaningful and important.
- c. I do interesting activities at school.
- d. At school, I help decide things like class activities or rules.
- e. At last one teacher or other adult at school listens to me when I have something to say.
- f. At least one teacher or other adult at school notices when I am not there.
- g. At least one teacher or other adult at school listens to students' ideas about how to improve the school.
- h. At least one teacher or other adult at school always wants me to do my best.
- i. At least one teacher or other adult at school really cares about me.
- j. The things I am learning in school will be important for my future.

Some of these items are certainly representative of resiliency, but they are not within the purview of the Afterschool programs in this project.

The remaining resiliency items do not show high levels of change to stronger resiliency on the posttest, but it is important not to discount the numbers of students who strongly agreed with some of the items on the pretest, and thus had no option of showing higher levels on the posttest with this response format. Over half of the participants fit this category on the last two items below (Table 8). Looking for a specific target percentage of students to score higher or more positively on the posttest thus becomes problematic using these items with these students.

Table 8. *Applicable Items Grades 6-12.*

	N	Posttest Higher	Pretest Ceiling*
8a. I do things at my school that make a difference.	69	24 34.8%	1 1.4%
9a. I enjoy working together with other students my age.	71	8 11.3%	16 22.5%
9b. I can work with someone who has different opinions than mine.	69	13 18.8%	4 5.8%
9c. I stand up for myself without putting others down.	69	13 18.8%	9 13.0%
9d. I plan to graduate from high school.	70	10 14.3%	43 61.4%
9e. I plan to go to college or some other school after high school.	62	6 9.7%	32 51.6%
9f. I have goals and plans for the future.	64	8 12.5%	39 60.9%

*Participant pretest rating of Strongly Agree (highest rating) was unchanged on posttest, but there was no opportunity for a higher rating.

Comparison of ratings for all items showed some positive movement even on items that were school related, as seen in Table 9. More than four out of every five students showed improvement on some item related to resiliency, and when only the seven items from the

previous table were considered, almost two thirds of the students still showed positive movement.

Table 9. *Comparison of student self ratings*

	N	%
Students showing movement from strongly disagree toward strongly agree on one or more items on posttest (all posttest items) (N = 72)	58	80.6%
Students showing no change on all posttest items	2	2.8%
Students showing movement from strongly disagree toward strongly agree on one or more items on posttest (items 8a, 9a through 9c)	47	65.3%
Students showing no change on posttest items 8a, 9a through 9e	10	13.9%

Thus, evidence of movement toward the attainment of the end outcome can be easily seen.

Strengthening Communities: Each year, 85% of 22 new afterschool program-community partners will report an increased capacity to provide services as a result of student involvement.

Output: *By the end of year three, 66 new afterschool-community partnerships will be created and documented.*

Based upon the three year projection of one partner per program per year and since there were 20 afterschool programs during year one, 20 partnerships should have been created and documented. Although implementation of service-learning activities in the afterschool programs began only in January, at least 22 formal partnerships have been established by the 20 afterschool programs as seen in the state report. LASSIE data indicate that most programs created one or more formal partnerships. Thus, the performance measure was exceeded in this first semester of implementation. In addition, other community organizations participated in informal capacities as volunteers with the afterschool programs.

Intermediate outcome: *By the end of year three, 85% of community partners will report an increased capacity to provide services as a result of afterschool student involvement.*

Partners were given the opportunity via the Memorandum of Agreement to report increased capacity to provide services as a result of afterschool involvement. Ninety-one percent (91%) of the formal partners indicated that this was an outcome of the partnership (Appendix E). The intermediate outcome was attained. Survey data provide additional support for this performance measurement, indicating the involvement of community partners. Only 4% of the 74 students in grades 6-12 who completed both surveys reported that the community partner participated in choosing the problem they worked on. In response to a subsequent question, however, almost 90% of the same participants reported the community partners helped them shape the project. The largest numbers of students indicated community members provided information and research (38%), suggested solutions (35%), chose a problem to work on (34%), and guided them in their service activities (30%). Additional discussion and examples can be seen with evaluation Question 3, *How is the project affecting community partners?*

End outcome: *By the end of year three, 70 community partnerships with afterschool programs are established supporting service-learning strategies beyond the Learn and Serve America grant.*

At this time, results for the intermediate outcome as reported above are applicable to this end outcome. Additional discussion related to this performance measurement can be found with evaluation Question 5, *How is sustainability of key components of the project being addressed?*

Needs and Activities: After three years, all of the 66 anti-meth communication resources will be generated by Afterschool participants, resulting in negative attitudes toward meth among 90% of K-12 students who see the anti-meth messages contributing to a reduction in the percentage of Tennessee teens lifetime use.

Output: *By the end of year three, 66 anti-meth communication products will be developed and distributed.*

Based upon the three-year projection of one anti-meth communication resource per program per year, during year one 20 products should have been created and disseminated. Although implementation of service-learning activities in the Afterschool programs began only in January, over 35 communication products have been created and disseminated from the 20 Afterschool programs. Thus, progress was made on the performance measure in the first semester of implementation. In addition, many programs focused additional activities on the meth prevention message, such as word searches, meth dodge ball, and research opportunities

Intermediate outcome: *By the end of year three, 90% of readers/hearers of the anti-meth communication products will indicate that they are less likely to use meth or confirmed in their opposition to meth as a result of one of the products.*

During this first year of implementation, responses from readers/hearers were primarily informal in nature. More consistent means of gathering reader/hearer data are being considered by the state and program administrators. Further discussion can be found with evaluation Question 2, *How is the program impacting participants' and beneficiaries' attitudes, knowledge and/or behaviors?*

End outcome: *The percentage of TN teen lifetime meth use will decline by 1%.*

Measurement of this outcome is beyond the scope of program evaluation. While admirable, evidence of lifetime meth use for participants and beneficiaries is decades in the future.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the data presented in response to this evaluation question, the evaluation team offers the following conclusions and recommendations:

Conclusions

1. The Afterschool Service-Learning Program was designed to serve up to 22 afterschool programs; 17 subgrants were actually awarded for the program. Two agencies administer multiple programs; thus, 17 agencies represent 20 afterchool programs.
2. The Afterschool Service-Learning Program is fully operational through 17 agencies representing 20 participating afterschool organizations. These include agencies in the following counties: Bradley, Cannon, Carroll, Crockett, Franklin, Gibson, Grundy,

Hamblen, Knox, Loudon, Madison, McMinn, McNairy, Montgomery, Putnam, Smith, and Sullivan.

3. The Afterschool Service-Learning Program provides services through the delegation of responsibilities to participating agencies subject to the provisions in the proposals for the subgrants.
4. Despite the statewide perspective of the program, the program is led and coordinated by a single State Program Coordinator and an Agency Program Coordinator in each of the 17 participating organizations.
5. Statewide performance measures have been established in three categories: Participant Development, Strengthening Communities, and Needs and Activities.
6. It is too early in the project to determine the full extent to which the project is achieving stated goals. Substantive progress has been made toward all performance measures.
7. Participant Development outputs and outcomes include developing skills in problem solving by participation in service-learning projects, and increased resiliency. The number of participants exceeded the performance output projected for one year. Examples of problem solving and resiliency were seen in anti-meth communication products and service-learning activities. Increase in problem solving skills for participants was also shown by self-report items for students in grades 6-12 on posttest surveys.
8. Learn and Serve America Resiliency Student surveys were given to many participants both as a pre- and post-test. Different surveys were used by one organization, and another organization used the pre-survey for grades 6-12 after the activities instead of the post-survey, which had additional items. Use of survey data was limited due to inconsistent administration of the same survey, and variable numbers of participants completing both surveys.
9. The performance output of Strengthening Communities was also exceeded by creating and documenting partnerships that reported increased capacity to provide services as a result of the Afterschool Service-Learning involvement.
10. The focus of Needs and Activities was the anti-meth communication resources and products. Each Afterschool Service-Learning Program produced at least one product related to meth and provided information to at least one community audience. Responses from readers/hearers were primarily informal and anecdotal in nature.

Recommendations

1. State Program Coordinator efforts to enhance project implementation for 2007-2008 are already underway and should continue to be implemented. The commitment to continuous improvement is noted by the evaluation team, and these efforts will prove to be valuable over time.
2. Since the Afterschool Service-Learning Program was designed to serve up to 22 programs, and only 20 programs were implemented in 2006-2007, implementation of additional programs should be a focus for upcoming years. Certificates of recognition would provide an appropriate award for individual participants.

3. The basic project model for service planning and delivery is commendable in that it empowers local communities to define their needs and propose strategies within the scope of the project. Continuous training will be necessary to ensure that local agencies have the knowledge and skills needed to maximize efforts and enhance student service-learning experiences.
4. State and agency program staff members have recently engaged in the reapplication and expansion process for the subgrants. New and renewed subgrants should be awarded soon.
5. The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should develop procedures for administration of pre- and post-surveys. This would include timeframe for administering surveys to participants and comparison groups, which surveys to use, and consistency in participant involvement at both pre- and post-administration.
6. The State Program Coordinator should review the use of the resiliency instrument to determine its applicability to the performance measure of Participant Development. A way to assess problem solving skills for grades 3-5, in addition to product examples, should be incorporated.
7. The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should develop procedures for collecting data related to the readers/hearers of the anti-meth communication products.

Evaluation Question Two: How is the program impacting participants' and beneficiaries' attitudes, knowledge and/or behaviors?

Learn and Serve America Meth Free TN: Youth Edition is a statewide grant program that supports integration of service-learning in afterschool programs to further statewide meth prevention initiatives by creating anti-meth communication products by youth for youth. Attitudes, knowledge and/or behaviors pertain to service-learning and civic engagement, as well as to the topic of methamphetamines and other drugs for both participants and beneficiaries.

Attitudes, Knowledge, and Behaviors Regarding Meth

As seen above, participants have created and disseminated over 35 anti-meth communication products. The content of the products themselves reflects the attitude and knowledge about the use of meth that the participants gained during the projects. Meth awareness skits, puppet shows, posters and banners provided information to a variety of audiences within the communities. Participant created books are being published to place in libraries and schools. Even program names indicate positive attitudes regarding the prevention of meth: Students Against Meth (SAM and S.A.M., I AM), Kids Against Meth Ending Lives (KAMEL) and Students and Teachers Against Meth Program (STAMP).

Creation and dissemination of the products reflect very public behaviors that project the knowledge and attitudes gained or strengthened by the activities within the projects. Other behaviors can be seen by the participation in a variety of school and community anti-meth activities, as mentioned in evaluation Question 1. During an evaluation team member observation of a carnival type event, participants manned a table with an anti-meth display and handed out brochures, pencils, and pictures to children and adults in attendance. Pictures showing the bodily dangers of the drug received the most outspoken reactions of participants and beneficiaries. One participant indicated that they were doing these activities and providing this information for other youth so that they would know the dangers and avoid them.

LASSIE reports of program outcomes indicate the Agency Program Coordinators' perceptions of program impact on participants and organizations served. The category of impact to 'habits' possibly relates to the question of changes in attitudes, knowledge, and behavior regarding meth. As seen below (Table 10) 94% of organizations indicated that the program had a substantial or moderate positive impact on 'habits.' One Agency Program Coordinator reported that the participants increased cooperative behaviors and teamwork. Another indicated the impact was on community awareness.

Table 10. *Positive Impact of LSA funded activities.*

	None n %	Moderate n %	Substantial n %	Unknown n %
Academic Performance	1 5.9%	14 82.4%	2 11.8%	0 0.0%
Habits	1 5.9%	9 52.9%	7 41.2%	0 0.0%
Civic Engagement	1 5.9%	5 29.4%	10 58.8%	1 5.9%
Program Permanency	1 5.9%	8 47.14%	8 47.14%	0 0.0%
Organizations Served	1 5.9%	5 29.4%	10 58.8%	1 5.9%

As reported above, responses from readers/hearers of the anti-meth communication products were primarily informal in nature. Although designed for the beneficiaries to be other youth, adults also received the information about the dangers of meth. During a telephone interview, one Agency Program Coordinator indicated that adults in the community "were actually the most impressed because they did not know as much. We raised awareness and have received calls from the public and other churches with requests about the presentation/information."

Attitudes, Knowledge, and Behaviors Regarding Service-learning

In addition to learning the specific information about drug use, participants learned and participated in the four phases of service-learning. The Corporation for National and Community Service indicates that by planning and implementing service-learning activities, youth develop practical skills, self-esteem, and increased civic engagement. Changes in attitudes and knowledge about the communities in which they live, and the potential impact they can have upon those communities can be seen in their activities, reflections, and responses to survey questions following those activities. Again the activities themselves indicate the behaviors that reflect the knowledge and attitudes about civic responsibility and self. In one case during reflections after events, participants "decided that sometimes doing a good deed for someone you do not know can really make a difference." Another LASSIE category of impact to 'civic engagement' possibly relates to the question of changes in attitudes, knowledge, and behavior regarding service-learning. As seen in Table 10 a majority of organizations (58.8%) indicated that the program had a substantial positive impact on civic engagement.

The impact on beneficiaries of the service-learning activities can best be seen by examples of those activities and the response of those involved, such as activities with senior citizens, and reading to younger children. In one case, participants conducted a needs assessment in their community and influenced the building of a new playground for neighborhood children.

During telephone interviews, program staff and adult volunteers also reported changes in their own knowledge, attitudes and behaviors regarding the use of meth and the process of

service-learning. A common attitude about service-learning is seen in this statement: “Learn and Serve is awesome, absolutely amazing, rewarding.” Expansion of service-learning throughout the after-school programs was a plan of several organizations. One program reported that the number of parents who showed up at the end-of-year celebration went from 400 to 600, attributable to the involvement of participants and their parents in the meth program. “The programs are wonderful for the kids: improves grades, behavior, and attitudes,” reported one Agency Program Coordinator.

The belief in the impact of the program on participants and community can also be seen through requests for continuance, and site expansion (Appendix F); all organizations requested continuance and a majority (10) requested expansion funding.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the data presented in response to this evaluation question, the evaluation team offers the following conclusions and recommendations:

Conclusions

1. The content of the anti-meth communication products reflects participants’ positive attitudes and knowledge about the use of meth.
2. Responses from readers/hearers of the anti-meth products were primarily informal in nature.
3. Participants’ constructive attitudes, knowledge and behaviors regarding service-learning and the community were seen in activities and survey responses.
4. Beneficiaries of the service-learning activities provided positive, but anecdotal, reactions.
5. Agency Program Coordinators expressed positive attitudes toward the project, perceiving many potential benefits to their organizations, participants, and communities.
6. All organizations requested continuance funds, and a majority requested expansion funds.

Recommendations

1. The State Program Coordinator should review the use of the resiliency instrument, or some other data collection strategy, to determine its applicability to determining program impact on participants’ attitudes, knowledge, and/or behaviors regarding meth and service-learning.
2. Procedures for collecting data from the beneficiaries of the service-learning activities and to the readers/hearers of the anti-meth communication products should be developed and implemented in all organizations consistently. An example can be seen in Appendix G.

Evaluation Question Three: How is the project affecting community partners?

The Afterschool Service-Learning Program began with a specific set of goals and objectives to be accomplished by the project. One of the requirements – and one of the performance measurements – was to engage at least one formal community partner for each year of the life of the grant. Results of the partnerships were outlined in evaluation Question 1, performance measure two, Strengthening Communities. Although implementation of service-

learning activities in the Afterschool programs began only in January, at least 22 formal partnerships have been established with the 20 Afterschool programs as seen in Appendix E. Ninety-one (91%) percent of the formal partners indicated increased capacity to provide services was an outcome of the partnership. Related discussions can also be seen in evaluation Question 5 regarding sustainability of the programs. At this early stage of the project, data has not been solicited from community partners.

An evaluation team member observed an example of partner participation at an Afterschool program-sponsored fashion show held at the local mall to present anti-meth designs and messages on participant-created jeans. The community DARE officer became interested and was also involved with the fashion show. Before, during, and after the fashion show, the Tennessee National Guard Counterdrug Division provided public access to its drug information trailer. The Tennessee National Guard is part of the Tennessee Methamphetamine Task Force, a formal partner with several organizations. Another program also designed and created blue jeans to be auctioned off in the fall.

Other examples of a Serve and Learn program impacting informal partners is the case of university students mentoring the participants and working with them after school, and forming teams with Boy Scouts to build/maintain a hiking trail around one organization campus.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the data presented in response to this evaluation question, the evaluation team offers the following conclusions and recommendations:

Conclusions

1. All organizations created and documented at least one partnership that reported increased capacity to provide services as a result of the Afterschool Service-Learning involvement.
2. At this early stage of the project, data have not been solicited from community partners.

Recommendations

1. The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should design data collection processes for community partners to address this evaluation.

Evaluation Question Four: What problems in project implementation have emerged? How have they been resolved?

In the early stages of the project, few implementation problems have been encountered at the state level. The State Program Coordinator feels that there are enough resources and staff support. "Sometimes we do things beyond our job description, but that is to help others at the agency who are involved in supporting our program." There were some issues that surfaced during the course of the first year. These include: having resources for age-appropriate materials, especially for younger children; assessing younger children; coming up with matching funds; traveling distance to Nashville; conflicting Spring Symposium with 21st CCLC meeting; and dealing with the realities of meth usage in families of participants (legalities, retaliation). Most problems were addressed directly with the organization involved; however, some questions remain to be resolved.

Overall, Agency Program Coordinators were highly complimentary of the program itself, and of the Afterschool State Program Coordinator. Interview questions regarding state support received very positive responses, such as "...enthusiasm overflows to us," "... couldn't be beat: helpful, flexible," "Support is awesome," "Site visits were made to our facility," "I like that they listen, then decide based on information from all sides," and "One of the best grant people I've worked with." Training, resources and symposium were mentioned as being "especially helpful." One suggestion about training and resources was that an idea book be created and shared so all programs could benefit from the thinking of others.

The State Program Coordinator provided agendas and evaluations of the fall and spring state-wide sessions (Appendices H and I). The fall session was primarily a training session that included the Lions Quest workshop; a community partner panel; and discussions of sustainability/resources, LSA grant requirements, and financial management and reporting. Evaluations indicated that the Lions Quest workshop was the most beneficial, mentioned 45% of the time as the part of the meeting most valuable, and having a 70% rating of high (5) on a 5-point scale. The next two most mentioned (20%) as valuable were the community partner panel and LSA grant requirements, with scores of high 70% and 60%, respectively. The purpose of the spring symposium was primarily for organizations to share their activities and products. The most valuable aspect of the symposium by unanimous response was the presentations by the individual community-based programs. Suggestions for improvements for both sessions were related to facilities and scheduling, not content. The State Program Coordinator recognized a need for additional training on developing community resources.

In addition, LASSIE reports provide information regarding the training or technical assistance strengths and needs of the programs. Responses indicate that organizations have strengths in a variety of categories with the most frequently mentioned being developing community partnerships, leadership development, and youth voice/youth governance. There is, however, a need in some agencies for the following areas in program management: assessing community impact, program evaluation strategies/performance measurement, financial/grant management, and marketing. In program content, the area of reflection techniques was the overwhelming category with nine organizations reporting that need.

The major problem came not with implementation of the program and activities, but with project data collection. The following conclusions and recommendations were reported in Evaluation Question #1 and are applicable here:

- Learn and Serve America Resiliency Student surveys were given to many participants both as a pre- and post-test. Different surveys were used by two organizations, and another organization used the pre-survey for grades 6-12 after the activities instead of the post-survey, which had additional items. Use of survey data was limited due to inconsistent administration of the same survey, and variable numbers of participants completing both surveys.
- The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should develop procedures for administration of pre- and post-surveys. This would include timeframe for administering surveys to participants and comparison groups, which surveys to use, and consistency in participant involvement at both pre- and post-administration.
- The State Program Coordinator should review the use of the resiliency instrument to determine its applicability to the performance measure of Participant Development. A way to assess problem solving skills for grades 3-5 in addition to product examples should be incorporated.

- The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should develop procedures for collecting data related to the readers/hearers of the anti-meth communication products.

Only sixty-two percent (62%) of the number of participants reported in LASSIE (997) responded to the pre-survey, with less than half (48%) completing the post-survey (Table 11). Comparative data showing possible participant changes were available only for those who completed both surveys: 48 in grades 3-5 and 74 in grades 6-12, or approximately 20% of pre-survey respondents. Responses of unrepresented participants may have differed from those completing both surveys and been sufficiently numerous to change the survey results that are represented in this report.

Table 11. *Pre- and Post-Survey Response Rates*

	Grades 3-5	Grades 6-12	Total Surveys	% of Total Participants (997)
Pre	249	367	616	62%
Post	247	229	476	48%

Note. Since survey applicable to grades 3-12, some agencies read the survey to younger participants.

As previously reported, each program is required to identify a comparison group to use in the evaluation process. Based upon results of the telephone surveys, it appears that very few have accomplished this task at the writing of this report. The majority (13) have plans to identify one this summer or at the beginning of the school year, with half of those having fairly specific ideas regarding the choice of group. Four indicated that they need assistance with finding a comparison group.

One additional concern from the Agency Program Coordinators' perspective was the lack of assessment regarding the knowledge of meth dangers and prevention, the learning focus of the projects.

Locally, additional problems surfaced as programs progressed through the first semester of activities. Based upon data gathered during telephone interviews with Agency Program Coordinators, the most mentioned concern (six occurrences) was consistency and retention of participants. Plans to address this issue were already being developed. These include providing alternative approaches to participation, accountability, and commitment, such as offering incentives, allowing make-up days for activities and communicating more with parents and community. It was hoped that increasing youth voice would also increase participation.

The next two issues (five occurrences each) were the newness of service-learning and knowledge about meth and the time involved in the program this year. As reported previously 11 of 17 agencies had less than one year's experience with service-learning. They liked giving the participants more freedom, but had to adjust procedures, attitudes and behaviors. An emphasis on the service-learning cycle and process for next year was indicated by several Agency Program Coordinators. Program staff learned about the use and dangers of meth with the participants; their knowledge will increase as they explore the topic more. The issue of time was related to the beginning of actual projects, primarily around the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day of Service activities. Agency Program Coordinators looked forward to starting earlier, with more time for research, to create products, and to conduct bigger projects. Scheduling could be more realistic with activities beginning at the start of the school/afterschool year.

Other concerns at the program level include changes in staff and in sites (for those with multiple sites, especially), and dealing with younger participants in activities and assessment. Hope for additional funding and concern with matching funds in small communities were also mentioned. All Agency Program Coordinators expressed a positive outlook for next year, especially with the further implementation of the service-learning cycle, as expressed by one, *"We are very excited, 100% sold!"*

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the data presented in response to this evaluation question, the evaluation team offers the following conclusions and recommendations:

Conclusions

1. Few project implementation problems have been encountered during the first project year.
2. Some concerns were expressed by individual community-based agencies that could be applicable state-wide: age appropriate resources for activities and assessments, training on matching funds, assessment of knowledge of meth dangers and prevention, and issues of legalities regarding drug usage.
3. The implementation activities have been perceived positively, including communications from the State Program Coordinator, training/sharing opportunities, and resources.
4. Individual agencies reported a variety of technical strengths and needs, with the area of reflection techniques being the greatest need. The State Program Coordinator recognizes a need for training on developing community resources.
5. Pre- and post-survey comparison data represented only about 20% of participants. Responses of unrepresented participants may have differed from those completing both surveys and been sufficiently numerous to change the survey results that are represented in this report.
6. The majority of agencies have plans to identify and involve a comparison group, but some still need assistance with this process.

Recommendations

1. The State Program Coordinator should continue to provide training, with additional focus on age appropriate resources for activities and assessments, matching funds, assessment of knowledge of meth dangers and prevention, issues of legalities regarding drug usage, reflection strategies, and developing community resources.
2. Procedures for administration of pre- and post-surveys should be developed more completely and implemented in all organizations consistently, with a focus on strategies to increase participant completion of both the pre- and post-survey to determine participant changes.
3. The State Program Coordinator should review the use of the resiliency instrument to determine its applicability to the performance measures of Participant Development and

Needs and Activities, focusing on the impact of activities regarding the use and prevention of meth.

4. The State Program Coordinator should provide assistance to all agencies regarding the determination of comparison group, and develop procedures for involvement of the comparison groups in assessment activities.

Evaluation Question Five: *How is sustainability of key components of the project being addressed?*

It is too early in the life of this project for much evidence to be available regarding sustainability of project elements beyond the grant. However, some initial favorable evidence was available during 2006-2007.

Based upon Volunteer Tennessee's guide for sustaining service-learning, *Sustaining Service-Learning: A Practitioner's Guide to Maintaining Long Term Programs* (Brantley, 2004), there are four strategies that promote sustainability for programs: Implementation, Partnerships, Resource Development, and Media Management. Some initial evidence of these four components as defined by the practitioner's guide can be seen in many of the individual programs. These are summarized from the guide (Brantley, 2004) and explored below.

Quality planning and implementation can set the stage for sustaining the program. Fundamental aspects of quality implementation include making the case accurately, high quality practice, pursue expansion strategies, and measure progress (Brantley, 2004). All subgrantees described the need for the LSA program in the application proposal. High quality practice that includes collaborative service-learning planning by agency staff and students, direct contact with beneficiaries, reflection and celebration, and student choice and decision-making can be seen in many program activities. By implementing the service-learning cycle, agencies engage in expansion strategies, such as starting small, spreading the word with youth as spokespersons, making results visible, providing ongoing professional development, and seeking supportive policies and funding. Participants spent time in structured reflections, such as drawings, discussions and journals. Pizza and ice-cream were popular in celebrations.

LASSIE reports included several sections of questions related to policies and practices within the organizations. A majority of organizations (53%) indicated that service-learning was a strategy related to its strategic or improvement plan, and was mentioned in materials at least 'occasionally'. Other policies or practices were not as strong: adoption of standards, criteria for hiring or evaluating employees, or inclusion in professional development.

A second component of sustainability is to create partnerships and to work effectively with other organizations within the community (Brantley, 2004). Development of partners was discussed in evaluation Question 1, performance measure two – Strengthening Communities. Within the 17 organizations, at least 22 formal partnerships were documented. As reported above from LASSIE reports, Agency Program Coordinators responded to the statement that 'projects are based in strong partnerships with community groups that include mutually agreed upon goals, roles and responsibilities.' Respondents had choices of 'never, rarely, occasionally, frequently, always, or don't know.' Over half (53%) reported 'always,' with another 29% reporting 'frequently.'

Resource Development relies on knowing your purpose and expanding networks to seek a variety of resources, such as in-kind or cash donations, special events, and public and private funding at the local, state, and federal levels (Brantley, 2004). Subgrantees submitted original grant proposals in 2006 and have recently submitted reapplication or expansion proposals

currently under consideration. All organizations requested continuance and a majority (10) requested expansion funding (Appendix F).

LASSIE reports provided information on support for service-learning programs in several categories: financial, workload reduction, technical assistance, and recognition or rewards. Fifty-nine (59%) percent reported that there was 'frequent' or 'always' financial support for planning, training, and implementation of service-learning projects or programs. Likewise a majority indicated technical assistance. However, less than half reported 'frequently' or 'always' a reduction in workload or recognition for quality service-learning practice. Agency Program Coordinators were staffed full or part time in 59% of the organizations. Of those full-time, five of the six reported 25% or more of the total job responsibilities were service-learning. Another positive indication of sustainability is the report from 16 of the 17 organizations that moderate or substantial positive impact was made in efforts to make service-learning permanent. As indicated in the State Program Coordinator interview, developing community resources should be a focus of training in the future.

The fourth strategy suggested (Brantley, 2004) is to build relationships with the media: newspapers, television, magazines, radio, even the Internet. Several agencies have formal and informal partnerships with local media, resulting in several service-learning projects and anti-meth products being highlighted in newspaper articles, and on a local cable station. Other public demonstrations include billboards, parades, booths at fairs, and public service announcements. Over the life of the project the evaluation team will be addressing program sustainability, and each year of the project will provide additional opportunities for more evidence of specific elements of the project that are likely to continue beyond the life of the grant.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the data presented in response to this evaluation question, the evaluation team offers the following conclusions and recommendations:

Conclusions

1. It is early in the life of the project; therefore, long-term sustainability of the project cannot yet be assessed.
2. Some potential signs of project sustainability are evident at the agency level relating to the four strategies that promote sustainability (Brantley, 2004): Implementation, Partnerships, Resource Development, and Media Management.
3. All community-based Afterschool agencies requested a continuance for 2007-2008 and a majority requested expansion funds.

Recommendations

1. As the project proceeds to years two and three, systematic sustainability planning should be addressed at the state and agency level. State provided training should focus on developing community resources.
2. The State Program Coordinator should promote, be alert to, recognize and document evidence of sustainability to the extent possible each year of the project.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

We have consolidated our conclusions and recommendations for each study question as follows:

Conclusions

1. The Afterschool Service-Learning Program was designed to serve up to 22 afterschool programs; 17 subgrants were actually awarded for the program. Two agencies administer multiple programs; thus, 17 agencies represent 20 afterschool programs.
2. The Afterschool Service-Learning Program is fully operational through 17 agencies representing 20 participating afterschool organizations. These include agencies in the following counties: Bradley, Cannon, Carroll, Crockett, Franklin, Gibson, Grundy, Hamblen, Knox, Loudon, Madison, McMinn, McNairy, Montgomery, Putnam, Smith, and Sullivan.
3. The Afterschool Service-Learning Program provides services through the delegation of responsibilities to participating agencies subject to the provisions in the proposals for the subgrants.
4. Despite the statewide perspective of the program, the program is led and coordinated by a single State Program Coordinator and an Agency Program Coordinator in each of the 17 participating organizations.
5. Statewide performance measures have been established in three categories: Participant Development, Strengthening Communities, and Needs and Activities.
6. It is too early in the project to determine the full extent to which the project is achieving stated goals. Substantive progress has been made toward all performance measures.
7. Participant Development outputs and outcomes include developing skills in problem solving by participation in service-learning projects, and increased resiliency. The number of participants exceeded the performance output projected for one year. Examples of problem solving and resiliency were seen in anti-meth communication products and service-learning activities. Increase in problem solving skills for participants was also shown by self-report items for students in grades 6-12 on posttest surveys.
8. Learn and Serve America Resiliency Student surveys were given to many participants both as a pre- and post-test. Different surveys were used by one organization, and another organization used the pre-survey for grades 6-12 after the activities instead of the post-survey, which had additional items. Use of survey data was limited due to inconsistent administration of the same survey, and variable numbers of participants completing both surveys.
9. The performance output of Strengthening Communities was also exceeded by creating and documenting partnerships that reported increased capacity to provide services as a result of the Afterschool Service-Learning involvement.
10. The focus of Needs and Activities was the anti-meth communication resources and products. Each Afterschool Service-learning program produced at least one product

- related to meth and provided information to at least one community audience. Responses from readers/hearers were primarily informal and anecdotal in nature.
11. The content of the anti-meth communication products reflects participants' positive attitudes and knowledge about the use of meth.
 12. Responses from readers/hearers of the anti-meth products were primarily informal in nature.
 13. Participants' constructive attitudes, knowledge and behaviors regarding service-learning and the community were seen in activities and survey responses.
 14. Beneficiaries of the service-learning activities provided positive, but anecdotal, reactions.
 15. Agency Program Coordinators expressed positive attitudes toward the project, perceiving many potential benefits to their organizations, participants, and communities.
 16. All organizations requested continuance funds, and a majority requested expansion funds.
 17. All organizations created and documented at least one partnership that reported increased capacity to provide services as a result of the Afterschool Service-Learning involvement.
 18. At this early stage of the project, data have not been solicited from community partners.
 19. Few project implementation problems have been encountered during the first project year.
 20. Some concerns were expressed by individual community-based agencies that could be applicable state-wide: age appropriate resources for activities and assessments, training on matching funds, assessment of knowledge of meth dangers and prevention, and issues of legalities regarding drug usage.
 21. The implementation activities have been perceived positively, including communications from the State Program Coordinator, training/sharing opportunities, and resources.
 22. Individual agencies reported a variety of technical strengths and needs, with the area of reflection techniques being the greatest need. The State Program Coordinator recognizes a need for training on developing community resources.
 23. Pre- and post-survey comparison data represented only about 20% of participants. Responses of unrepresented participants may have differed from those completing both surveys and been sufficiently numerous to change the survey results that are represented in this report.
 24. The majority of agencies have plans to identify and involve a comparison group, but some still need assistance with this process.
 25. It is early in the life of the project; therefore, long-term sustainability of the project cannot yet be assessed.

26. Some potential signs of project sustainability are evident at the agency level relating to the four strategies that promote sustainability (Brantley, 2004): Implementation, Partnerships, Resource Development, and Media Management.

Recommendations

1. State Program Coordinator efforts to enhance project implementation for 2007-2008 are already underway and should continue to be implemented. The commitment to continuous improvement is noted by the evaluation team, and these efforts will prove to be valuable over time.
2. Since the Afterschool Service-Learning Program was designed to serve up to 22 programs, and only 20 programs were implemented in 2006-2007, implementation of additional programs should be a focus for upcoming years. Certificates of recognition would provide an appropriate award for individual participants.
3. The basic project model for service planning and delivery is commendable in that it empowers local communities to define their needs and propose strategies within the scope of the project. Continuous training will be necessary to ensure that local agencies have the knowledge and skills needed to maximize efforts and enhance student service-learning experiences.
4. State and agency program staff members have recently engaged in the reapplication and expansion process for the subgrants. New and renewed subgrants should be awarded soon.
5. The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should develop procedures for administration of pre- and post-surveys. This would include timeframe for administering surveys to participants and comparison groups, which surveys to use, and consistency in participant involvement at both pre- and post-administration.
6. The State Program Coordinator should review the use of the resiliency instrument to determine its applicability to the performance measure of Participant Development. A way to assess problem solving skills for grades 3-5, in addition to product examples, should be incorporated.
7. The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should develop procedures for collecting data related to the readers/hearers of the anti-meth communication products.
8. The State Program Coordinator should review the use of the resiliency instrument, or some other data collection strategy, to determine its applicability to determining program impact on participants' attitudes, knowledge, and/or behaviors regarding meth and service-learning.
9. Procedures for collecting data from the beneficiaries of the service-learning activities and to the readers/hearers of the anti-meth communication products should be developed and implemented in all organizations consistently. An example can be seen in Appendix G.
10. The State Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the evaluation team, should design data collection processes for community partners to address this evaluation.

11. The State Program Coordinator should continue to provide training, with additional focus on age appropriate resources for activities and assessments, matching funds, assessment of knowledge of meth dangers and prevention, issues of legalities regarding drug usage, reflection strategies, and developing community resources.
12. Procedures for administration of pre- and post-surveys should be developed more completely and implemented in all organizations consistently, with a focus on strategies to increase participant completion of both the pre- and post-survey to determine participant changes.
13. The State Program Coordinator should review the use of the resiliency instrument to determine its applicability to the performance measures of Participant Development and Needs and Activities, focusing on the impact of activities regarding the use and prevention of meth.
14. The State Program Coordinator should provide assistance to all agencies regarding the determination of comparison group, and develop procedures for involvement of the comparison groups in assessment activities.
15. As the project proceeds to years two and three, systematic sustainability planning should be addressed at the state and agency level. State provided training should focus on developing community resources.
16. The State Program Coordinator should promote, be alert to, recognize and document evidence of sustainability to the extent possible each year of the project.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. Learn and Serve America Resilience Student Surveys: Grades 3-5, Grades 6-12/Pre, and Grades 6-12/Post

APPENDIX B. LASSIE Data on Agencies and Participants

APPENDIX C. Examples of Anti-Meth Communication Products by Agency

APPENDIX D. Learn and Serve America Resilience Student Survey Results

APPENDIX E. Community Partners

APPENDIX F. Application and Expansion Requests

APPENDIX G. Example of Procedures for Collecting Beneficiary Data

APPENDIX H. Training Institute and Symposium Agendas

APPENDIX I. Service-Learning Training Institute and Symposium Evaluation Summaries

Resilience Learn and Serve Student Survey (Grades 3-5)

Corporation for National and Community Service - 1 - Resilience Learn and Serve Grades 3-5

Directions: We are conducting a study of students' opinions about their school and their community. This is a *survey*, not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. It is important that you answer each question honestly. The survey will take about 20 minutes to complete. You do not have to take part in the study, and you can stop taking part at any time. You can skip a question if you do not want to answer it. If you have any questions about the survey, please raise your hand and the person giving the survey will help you.

By writing your name below, you agree to complete the survey. Your individual answers will not be shared.

Name (please print): _____

Name (signature): _____

Date: _____

**Learn and Serve America
Student Resilience Survey (Grades 3-5)**

School: _____ Teacher: _____

What is today's date? _____

Are you a boy or a girl? **Boy** **Girl**

What grade are you in? _____

Directions:

For the next set of sentences, please check the box that shows how you feel.

For example, the first sentence is "I like to eat pizza." If you really hate to eat pizza, you would check the box above the words "Strongly Disagree." If you just do not like to eat pizza, check the box above the word "Disagree." If you sometimes like to eat pizza, check the box above the word "Agree." If you love to eat pizza, check the box above the words "Strongly Agree."

1. I like to eat pizza.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

2. I can make a difference in my neighborhood or town.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

3. I like being at school.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

4. I feel safe in school.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

5. At school, I help decide things like class activities or rules.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

6. The work I do at school is interesting.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

7. I stand up for myself without putting others down.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

8. I am good at leading a group project.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

9. At least one teacher or other adult at my school really cares about me.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

😊 **Thanks for filling out our survey!!**

Resiliency Learn and Serve Student Survey (Grades 6-12)
--

School : _____ Teacher : _____

1. Today's date: _____

2. Are you a male or female?

Male Female

3. Grade level: _____

4. How would you describe your ethnic background? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

- White
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black/African American
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Hispanic/Latino
- Other (specify): _____

5. Have you ever been involved in any of the following? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

- Sports
- Academic Club (for example, Math Club, Drama Club)
- Service Club (e.g., Scouts, Key Club, 4H, Booster Club. This does not include "service-learning" projects.)
- Student Leadership Group (for example, student council)
- Other clubs
- Job
- None of the above

6. Have you ever been a volunteer or provided community service? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

- Yes, in school
- Yes, with a youth organization
- Yes, with my church
- Yes, with my family
- Yes, with my neighborhood
- No

7. What grades do you get, on average?

- Mostly A's
- Mostly B's
- Mostly C's
- Mostly D's
- Mostly F's

Your School

8. Please indicate how much you disagree or agree with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. I do things at my school that make a difference.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. At least one teacher or other adult at school believes I will be a success.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The school work I am assigned is meaningful and important.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I do interesting activities at school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. At school, I help decide things like class activities or rules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. At least one teacher or other adult at school listens to me when I have something to say.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. At least one teacher or other adult at school notices when I am not there.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. At least one teacher or other adult at school listens to students' ideas about how to improve the school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. At least one teacher or other adult at school always wants me to do my best.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. At least one teacher or other adult at school really cares about me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The things I am learning in school will be important for my future.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

About You

9. Please indicate how much you disagree or agree with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. I enjoy working together with other students my age.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. I can work with someone who has different opinions than mine.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. I stand up for myself without putting others down.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I plan to graduate from high school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. I plan to go to college or some other school after high school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. I have goals and plans for the future.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Resilience Learn and Serve Student Survey (Grades 6-12)

Corporation for National and Community Service - 1 - Resilience Learn and Serve Grades 6-12.

Directions: We are conducting a study of students' opinions about their school and their community. This is a *survey*, not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. It is important that you answer each question honestly. The survey will take about 20 minutes to complete. You do not have to take part in the study, and you can stop taking part at any time. You can skip a question if you do not want to answer it. If you have any questions about the survey, please raise your hand and the person giving the survey will help you.

By writing your name below, you agree to complete the survey. Your individual answers will not be shared.

Name (please print): _____

Name (signature): _____

Date: _____

Resilience Learn and Serve Student Survey (Grades 6-12)
--

School : _____ Teacher _____
--

1. Today's date: _____

2. Are you a male or female?

Male Female

3. Grade level: _____

4. How would you describe your ethnic background? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

- White
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black/African American
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Hispanic/Latino
- Other (specify): _____

5. Have you ever been involved in any of the following? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

- Sports
- Academic Club (for example, Math Club, Drama Club)
- Service Club (e.g., Scouts, Key Club, 4H, Booster Club. This does not include "service-learning" projects.)
- Student Leadership Group (for example, student council)
- Other clubs
- Job
- None of the above

6. Have you ever been a volunteer or provided community service? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

- Yes, with my family
- Yes, in school before this year
- Yes, with a youth organization
- Yes, with my church
- Yes, with my neighborhood
- No

7. What grades do you get, on average?

- Mostly A's
- Mostly B's
- Mostly C's
- Mostly D's
- Mostly F's

Your School

8. Please indicate how much you disagree or agree with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. I do things at my school that make a difference.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. At least one teacher or other adult at school believes I will be a success.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The school work I am assigned is meaningful and important.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I do interesting activities at school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. At school, I help decide things like class activities or rules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. At least one teacher or other adult at school listens to me when I have something to say.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. At least one teacher or other adult at school notices when I am not there.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. At least one teacher or other adult at school listens to students' ideas about how to improve the school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. At least one teacher or other adult at school always wants me to do my best.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. At least one teacher or other adult at school really cares about me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The things I am learning in school will be important for my future.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

About You

9. Please indicate how much you disagree or agree with each of the following statements.

Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. I enjoy working together with other students my age.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. I can work with someone who has different opinions than mine.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. I stand up for myself without putting others down.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I plan to graduate from high school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. I plan to go to college or some other school after high school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. I have goals and plans for the future.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. Please rate yourself on the skills below. On the LEFT of the skill, please rate yourself based on how good were you at the beginning of your service-learning project. On the RIGHT of the skill, please rate how good you are NOW.

Beginning of Project Skill Now

Not Good At All	Fairly Good	Very Good	Excellent		Not Good At All	Fairly Good	Very Good	Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EXAMPLE: (You feel you went from fairly good to very good at...) Shooting a basketball	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a. Finding resources for a community project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b. Leading a group project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c. Understanding what other people are trying to say.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d. Getting others to listen to my ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	e. Speaking in front of groups of people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	f. Predicting the consequences of actions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	g. Finding information to solve problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h. Writing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	i. Doing research on problems in the community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	j. Helping other students to resolve their conflicts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

About Your Project

11. Who chose the problem you worked on? (check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Our teacher | <input type="checkbox"/> Our principal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Our community partner | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult volunteers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> We students | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

12. About how many hours did you spend on your service activities during your project?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input type="checkbox"/> 11-20 hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 5 hours | <input type="checkbox"/> 21 or more hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5-10 hours | |

13. How did you reflect on your project activities? (check all that apply)

- By writing
- By having conversations led by a teacher/group leader
- By having conversations led by another student
- By doing skits, poems, or plays
- By creating a display for parents or other members of the public
- Other

14. What topics did you focus your reflections on? (check all that apply)

- How I felt as I went through the project
- How our group made decisions about the project
- Course-related information we learned while doing the service activities
- Ethical issues related to the service project
- How to deal with setbacks to our project plans
- Other

15. How well did the service project help you understand course material?

- Not at all
- A little bit
- Somewhat
- A good bit
- A lot

16. In which ways did community partners help you shape your project? (check all that apply)

- Not at all
- Choosing a problem to work on
- Providing information and research
- Suggesting solutions to the problem(s)
- Guiding us in our service activities
- Other

17. How much do you feel your views and ideas shaped your service project?

- Not at all
- A little bit
- Somewhat
- A good bit
- A lot

Appendix B. LASSIE Data on Agencies and Participants

Agency information

Agency	# of staff	# of youth leaders/ volunteers	# of adult leaders/ volunteers	first grant	# years service-learning at organization
Bells City Schools	6	3	20	y	<1
Boys and Girls Club Lenoir City/Loudon County	10	5	9	y	2--5
Boys and Girls Club Vestal/Knox County	6	18	15		2--5
Break the Cycle, Inc.	10	41	20	y	2--5
REACH/Cannon County	12	15	65	y	2--5
First Missionary Baptist Church	2	10	4	y	<1
Franklin County Schools	4	0	20	dk	<1
Etowah/Little Children of the World	4	3	16	y	<1
KAMEL/McNairy School District	6	2	3	n	<1
Jaguar Learning Academy/Northeast Middle School	17	13	20	y	<1
Sonshine Avenue Ministry (2)	67	21	18	y	2--5
Clarksburg School/So. Carroll County	3	10	20	y	<1
Tennessee Tech University/CCR&R (3)	13		60	y	6+
Tennessee Community Assistance Corporation	5	19	47	y	<1
Tracy City Elementary School	4	9	20	y	<1
Trenton Housing Authority	12	5	22	y	<1
YWCA of Bristol	5	2	29	y	<1

Note. y = yes, n = no, dk = don't know.

Participants by grade level.

Agency	k	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Bells City Schools					18	15								33	
Boys and Girls Club Lenoir City/Loudon County				10	15	9	6	4	2					46	
Boys and Girls Club Vestal/Knox County				6	10	11	8	9						44	
Break the Cycle, Inc. REACH/Cannon County	15	20	20	20	20	20	40	10		5	15	10	5	200	
First Missionary Baptist Church				4	3	3		10	3			2	5	30	
Franklin County Schools							13	10	10					33	
Etowah/Little Children of the World	1	1	3	5	4	3	3	2	4	3			1	30	
KAMEL/McNairy School District								21	30					51	
Jaguar Learning Academy/ Northeast Middle School								68	36					104	
Sonshine Avenue Ministry (2) Clarksburg School/So.Carroll County					16	14	25	8			4	10	7	9	30
Tennessee Tech University/CCR&R (3)	22	22	19	6	19	13	6							109	
Tennessee Community Assistance Corporation	8	4	4	2	2	2	1	1	5	2	0	4	2	38	
Tracy City Elementary School				8	7	10	7	4	5					41	
Trenton Housing Authority	5	9	12	11	16	11	7	10	3					84	
YWCA of Bristol						10	5	10	5					30	
Total	51	56	58	72	130	121	143	174	105	14	25	23	22	997	

Participant Demographics

Agency	Hispanic		Asian	Black	White	2 or more	Unknown	male	female
	yes	no							
Bells City Schools	15	18		12	21			17	16
Boys and Girls Club Lenoir City/Loudon County	2	44	1	3	40	2		27	19
Boys and Girls Club Vestal/Knox County	3	41		19	18	4	3	20	24
Break the Cycle, Inc.	2	29		1	28		2	15	16
REACH/Cannon County First Missionary Baptist Church	8	192			196	4		95	105
Franklin County Schools	1	32		30	5	28		15	15
Etowah/Little Children of the World	3	27	1	3	21	2	3	8	22
KAMEL/McNairy School District	1	50		17	32	2		20	31
Jaguar Learning Academy/Northeast Middle School	16	88	3	85	12	4		67	37
Sonshine Avenue Ministry (2)	2	61		8	53	2		38	25
Clarksburg School/So. Carroll County	1	29		1	29			10	20
Tennessee Tech University/CCR&R (3)	5	104	1	7	101			62	47
Tennessee Community Assistance Corporation	4	32		3	32	2	1	18	20
Tracy City Elementary School	0	41			41			14	27
Trenton Housing Authority	0	84		60	19	5		50	34
YWCA of Bristol	0	30		8	20	2		0	30
Total	63	902	6	262	691	29	9	490	507

Appendix C.
Examples of Anti-Meth Communication Products by Agency

Agency	Anti-meth communication products				
Bells City Schools	PowerPoint presentation				
Boys and Girls Club Lenoir City/Loudon County	T-shirts	Bulletin board	Pencils	CD with pictures	Float
Boys and Girls Club Vestal/Knox County	T-shirts	Flyers	Fun Day Booth		
Break the Cycle, Inc.	School lobby ceiling tiles	School lobby display	Blue jeans	Documentary film	
Clarksburg School/So.Carroll County	PowerPoint presentation				
Cannon County/ REACH	Brochure/flyer	Warning signs handout			
Etowah/Little Children of the World	Brochure/flyer	Banners for march	Fair Booth		
First Missionary Baptist Church	Skit	Demonstration			
Franklin County Schools	Billboard	Flyers			
Jaguar Learning Academy/Northeast Middle School	T-shirts	Worksheets			
KAMEL/McNairy School District	Brochure/flyer	Cheers	Puppet skit	PowerPoint presentation	
Sonshine Avenue Ministry	Backpacks	Bracelet	Pledge card	Facts card	PowerPoint presentation
Tennessee Community Assistance Corporation	Blue jeans	T-shirts	Poster/display		
Tennessee Tech University/CCR&R	Booklet	Posters	Book	Safety Fest display	Pledges
Tracy City Elementary School	Published book				
Trenton Housing Authority	Parade Float				
YWCA of Bristol	Brochure/flyer	Library display	Table at Block Party		

Learn and Serve America Resilience Student Survey Results

**Resilience Learn and Serve
Student Survey Grades 3-5**

Summary

Paired Data: N = 48 except item 9.

Sites represented: 6

Boys: 23, Girls: 25

Grades represented:

Second	3
Third	10
Fourth	17
Fifth	16
Sixth	1

Grades are reported from the pretest. Some students did not report the same grade level on the posttest.

Item		Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Mean	Change
2. I can make a difference in my neighborhood or town. -	pre	2	16	22	8	2.75	
	post	3	8	23	14	3.00	+.25
5. At school, I help decide things like class activities or rules.		7	19	16	5	2.35	
		8	15	17	7	2.52	+.17
9. At least one teacher or other adult at my school really cares about me. (N = 47)		3	0	17	27	3.43	
		1	3	16	27	3.47	+.04
1. I like to eat pizza (Example)		2	2	23	21	3.31	
		1	1	27	19	3.33	+.02
8. I am good at leading a group project.		9	9	16	14	2.73	
		5	14	20	9	2.69	-.04
4. I feel safe in school.		3	4	25	16	3.13	
		3	6	23	16	3.08	-.05
3. I like being at school.		10	9	21	8	2.56	
		10	10	22	6	2.50	-.06
7. I stand up for myself without putting others down.		2	7	26	13	3.04	
		3	11	22	12	2.90	-.14
6. The work I do at school is interesting.		9	6	25	9	2.69	
		9	13	20	6	2.48	-.21

Ranked in order of mean change

Learn and Serve America Resilience Student Survey Results

**Resilience Learn and Serve
Student Survey Grades 6-12**

Summary

Paired Data: N = 74 (Two individuals did not complete any of the items below on one administration, leaving a possible N of 72.)

Sites represented: 7

Males: 29, Females: 45

Grades represented:

Sixth	17
Seventh	20
Eighth	13
Ninth	4
Tenth	10
Eleventh	5
Twelfth	5

Item	n	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Mean	Change
8a. I do things at my school that make a difference.	69	5 1	24 14	39 49	1 5	2.52 2.84	 +.32
8i. At least one teacher or other adult at school always wants me to do my best.	67	2 0	2 2	32 31	31 34	3.37 3.48	 +.11
8j. At least one teacher or other adult at school really cares about me.	68	2 4	6 5	43 33	17 26	3.10 3.19	 +.09
8c. The school work I am assigned is meaningful and important.	69	5 5	11 6	42 46	11 12	2.86 2.94	 +.08
8d. I do interesting activities at school.	67	3 4	18 12	30 35	16 16	2.88 2.94	 +.06
8b. At least one teacher or other adult at school believes I will be a success.	68	0 2	2 1	42 35	24 30	3.32 3.37	 +.05
8e. At school, I help decide things like class activities or rules.	66	10 9	17 26	23 27	6 4	2.38 2.39	 +.01
9d. I plan to graduate from high school.	70	1 1	2 0	15 17	52 51	3.69 3.70	 +.01
9f. I have goals and plans for the future.	64	0 1	2 1	15 17	47 45	3.70 3.66	 -.04
8f. At least one teacher or other adult at school listens to me when I have something to say.	67	3 3	4 8	41 38	19 18	3.13 3.06	 -.07

Appendix D.
Learn and Serve America Resilience Student Survey Results

Item	n	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)	Mean	Change
8k. The things I am learning in school will be important for my future.	69	1 2	4 4	26 28	38 35	3.46 3.39	-.07
8g. At least one teacher or other adult at school notices when I am not there.	69	0 3	7 7	42 41	20 18	3.19 3.07	-.12
8h. At least one teacher or other adult at school listens to students' ideas about how to improve the school.	68	5 6	11 12	37 40	15 10	2.91 2.79	-.12
9c. I stand up for myself without putting others down.	69	1 7	10 5	38 39	20 18	3.12 2.99	-.13
9b. I can work with someone who has different opinions than mine.	69	3 5	8 12	42 39	16 13	3.03 2.87	-.16
9e. I plan to go to college or some other school after high school	62	1 4	1 0	16 20	44 38	3.66 3.48	-.18
9a. I enjoy working together with other students my age.	71	0 3	4 5	36 40	31 23	3.38 3.17	-.21

Ranked in order of mean change

**Answers to Other Grades 6-12 Posttest Questions
Summary**

11. Who chose the problem you worked on?

41	23.1%	Our teacher
3	4.0%	Our community partner
16	21.6%	We students
10	13.5%	Our principal
16	21.6%	Adult volunteers
16	21.6%	Other
17	23.0%	Multiple responses

12. About how many hours did you spend on your service activities during your project?

9	12.2%	None
29	39.2%	Less than 5 hours
17	23.0%	5-10 hours
8	10.8%	11-20 hours
4	5.4%	21 or more hours
7	9.5%	No response

13. How did you reflect on your project activities?

31	41.9%	By writing
30	40.5%	By having conversations led by a teacher/group leader
19	25.7%	By having conversations led by another student
6	8.1%	By doing skits, poems, or plays
13	17.6%	By creating a display for parents or other members of the public
21	28.4%	Other

14. What topics did you focus your reflections on?

23	31.1%	How I felt as I went through the project
23	31.1%	How our group made decisions about the project
15	20.3%	Course-related information we learned while doing the service activities
8	10.8%	Ethical issues related to the service project
14	18.9%	How to deal with setbacks to our project plans
19	25.7%	Other

15. How well did the service project help you understand course material?

6	8.1%	Not at all
8	0.8%	A little bit
16	21.6%	Somewhat
18	24.3%	A good bit
20	27.0%	A lot
6	8.1%	No response

16. In which ways did community partners help you shape your project?

8	10.8%	Not at all
25	33.8%	Choosing a problem to work on
28	37.8%	Providing information and research
26	35.1%	Suggesting solutions to the problem(s)
22	29.7%	Guiding us in our service activities
13	17.6%	Other

Learn and Serve America Resilience Student Survey Results

17. How much do you feel your views and ideas shaped your service project?

5	6.8%	Not at all
7	9.5%	A little bit
21	28.4%	Somewhat
22	29.7%	A good it
12	16.2%	A lot
7	9.5%	No response

Demographic Items from Pretest

4. How would you describe your ethnic background

58	78.4%	White
1	1.4%	Asian/Pacific Islander
11	14.9%	Black/African American
5	6.8%	American Indian/Alaskan Native
0	0.0%	Hispanic/Latina
2	2.7%	Other

5. Have you ever been involved in any of the following? (From initial survey)

59	79.7%	Sports
14	18.9%	Academic Cub (for example, Math Club, Drama Club)
40	54.1%	Service Club (e.g., Scouts, Key Club, 4H, Booster Club. This does not include "service-learning" projects.)
17	23.0%	Student Leadership Group (for example, student council)
25	33.8%	Other clubs
16	21.6%	Job
2	2.7%	None of the above

6. Have you ever been a volunteer or provided community service? (From initial survey)

25	33.8%	Yes in school before this year
9	12.2%	Yes, with a youth organization
27	36.5%	Yes, with my church
16	21.6%	Yes, with my family
8	10.8%	Yes, with my neighborhood
21	28.4%	No

Student self report question 7. What grades do you get, on average? Mostly A's, Mostly B's, Mostly C's, Mostly D's, Mostly F's

	Pretest	Posttest
A	22	22
As and Bs	4	4
B (Including As, Bs, and Cs checked)	17	15
Bs and Cs	1	1
C	14	23
Cs and Ds	4	2
Ds	4	4
F	3	2
No response	5	1

Problem-Solving Skills Before and After Project

Self Ratings by Students in Grades 6-12 on the Posttest

The top line for each skill is the students' ratings of how good they thought they were at the beginning of the service-learning project. The second line is their rating of how good they think they are now.

	N	Not Good At All	Fairly Good	Very Good	Excel- lent
a. Finding resources for a community project.	61	12 3	32 18	8 27	9 13
b. Leading a group project.	62	13 2	26 15	13 30	10 15
c. Understanding what other people are trying to say	60	5 1	20 7	24 28	11 24
d. Getting others to listen to my ideas	62	11 2	23 18	18 26	10 16
e. Speaking in front of groups of people	59	25 15	17 17	10 17	7 10
f. Predicting the consequences of actions	62	8 4	31 16	13 25	10 17
g. Finding information to solve problems	61	4 3	25 12	23 32	9 14
h. Writing	62	6 1	28 18	20 26	8 17
i. Doing research on problems in the community	62	12 2	28 26	15 21	7 13
j. Helping other students to resolve their conflicts.	62	8 5	26 12	21 29	7 16

METH FREE TN: YOUTH EDITION COMMUNITY PARTNERS	Yes	No
Bells Elementary School:		
Crockett County Extension Office	X	
Boys & Girls Clubs of TN Valley: Lenoir City/Loudon Co.		
Boys & Girls Clubs of TN Valley: Vestal Club		
Break the Cycle, Inc.:		
Smith County Sheriff's Department		
Cannon County REACH		
Cannon County Senior Center	X	
First Missionary Baptist Church		
Franklin County Board of Education:		
City of Winchester Police Department	X	
12 th Judicial Drug Court	X	
Little Children of the World, Inc. Camp Etowah:		
McMinn County Alternative to Suspension (MCATS)		
McNairy County Schools:		
Selmer Lions Clubs	X	
First Baptist Church Team Kids	X	
West Tennessee Drug Task Force	X	
McNairy County Drug Alliance	X	
Northeast Middle School:		
Jaguar Learning Academy	X	
Sonshine Avenue Ministry:		
Logan's Roadhouse	X	
Catering and Creations	X	
South Carroll Special School District:		
Huntingdon Lions Club	X	
Tennessee's Community Assistance Corporation:		
Tennessee Meth Task Force	X	
TTU Upper Cumberland CCR&R		
Putnam County Safe & Drug Free Schools	X	
Middle Tennessee Meth Task Force	X	

Appendix E.
Community Partners

Tracy City Elementary:		
P3 (Positive Peer Pressure)	x	
Trenton Housing Authority		
YWCA Bristol:		
TN National Guard Counter Drug Division	x	
Alpha Phi Omega – Virginia Intermont College	x	
Bristol Public Library (Teen Program)	x	
Girls Inc. of Bristol	x	

Meth Free TN: Youth Edition Applicant Roster

	Continuation Request Yr 2	Expansion Funding
Bells City Schools	x	x
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Tennessee Valley (Lenior City/Loudon County Club Site)	x	
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Tennessee Valley (Vestal Club Site)	x	
Break the Cycle, Inc.	x	x
Cannon County REACH Programs	x	x
Fayette County Schools		
First Missionary Baptist Church Meth Awareness Program	x	
Franklin County Board of Education	x	
Little Children of the World - Camp Etowah After school Program	x	x
McNairy School District	x	x
Northeast Middle School	x	x
Sonshine Avenue Ministry	x	x - \$10,000
South Carroll Special School District	x	
Tennessee's Community Assistance Corporation (TCAC)	x	x -\$5,000
Tennessee Tech University Upper Cumberland CCR&R	x	x -\$5,000
Tracy City Elementary	x	
Trenton Housing Authority	x	x
YWCA Bristol	x	

Provide a very brief survey to return to participate in a drawing for a prize. When a completed survey is turned in, give the respondent a ticket for a prize drawing.

The survey might have questions such as the following:

1. Do you know someone who uses meth?
 - a. Yes _____
 - b. No _____
2. Did you learn something from this activity/brochure about meth?
 - a. Yes _____
 - b. No _____
3. How has this influenced your attitude toward the use of meth?
 - a. I am more likely to use meth.
 - b. I am less likely to use meth.
 - c. My attitude did not change.



Afterschool Service-Learning Institute 2006

Agenda

Tuesday, November 14 – Holiday Inn Select Vanderbilt – Centennial A&B

10:00a* – 5:30p Lions-Quest: Service-Learning Implementation and Integration (lunch will be provided)

6:30p Dinner at hotel: National Service 101 / Team Tennessee

Wednesday, November 15 – Scarritt Bennett – Laskey B

7:30a Breakfast – Gray Dining Hall
8:15a Registration & Sign In
8:40a Welcome and Overview
9:00a Developing Partnerships & Recruiting Volunteers
10:15a Break
10:30a Sustaining Programs & Sharing Resources
11:30a Lunch w/ Team Tennessee – Gray Dining Hall
12:30p Grant Requirements, Expectations & Evaluation
2:00p Break
2:15p Financial Management
3:30p Closing Reflection

*Please arrive a few minutes early for registration and don't forget this is Central Standard Time. Everyone please plan to attend both days of the training.



Tennessee Learn and Serve America Symposium Music City Sheraton

May 10-11, 2007

Agenda

Thursday, May 10

<i>3:00-3:30 pm CDT</i>	<i>Registration</i>	<i>Tulip Grove Breezeway</i>
<i>3:30-4:00 pm</i>	<i>Welcome/Introductions</i>	<i>Tulip Grove E</i>
<i>4:00-4:30 pm</i>	<i>LASSIE</i>	<i>Tulip Grove E</i>
<i>4:30-5:00 pm</i>	<i>Continuation Request, Reimbursement, Resource</i>	<i>Tulip Grove E and Oaklands</i>
	<i>Sharing</i>	
<i>5:00-5:30 pm</i>	<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Tulip Grove E and Oaklands</i>
<i>6:00-7:00 pm</i>	<i>Dinner</i>	<i>Tulip Grove E</i>
<i>7:00-7:30 pm</i>	<i>Run-through for presentation equipment</i>	<i>Oaklands and Evergreen</i>

Friday, May 11

<i>6:30-7:30 am CDT</i>	<i>Breakfast/Checkout</i>	<i>Tulip Grove E</i>
<i>7:45-9:10 am</i>	<i>Presentations in assigned rooms</i>	<i>Oaklands and Evergreen</i>
	<i>(see handout for presentation times)</i>	
<i>9:10-9:25 am</i>	<i>Break/Checkout</i>	
<i>9:25-10:35 am</i>	<i>Presentations in assigned rooms</i>	<i>Oaklands and Evergreen</i>
<i>10:35-10:50 am</i>	<i>Break/Checkout</i>	
<i>10:50-11:36 am</i>	<i>Presentations in assigned rooms</i>	<i>Oaklands and Evergreen</i>
<i>11:36-1:00pm</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Tulip Grove E</i>
	<i>Keynote Speaker: Susie Bunch, Asst. Commissioner of Teaching and Learning, Tennessee Department of Education</i>	
	<i>Presentation: S.A.M., I Am--Meth Free TN: Youth Edition afterschool program, Bradley County</i>	
<i>1:00-1:58 pm</i>	<i>Presentations in assigned rooms</i>	<i>Oaklands and Evergreen</i>
<i>1:58-2:45 pm</i>	<i>Closing Circle & Recognition</i>	<i>Oaklands and Evergreen</i>

Learn & Serve America

Afterschool Service-Learning Grantee Meeting

November 14-15, 2006

Please take a moment to complete this evaluation. Your feedback will play a key role in guiding training and technical assistance for this program. Please rate the following on a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being the highest). Thanks!

	Low					High
1. Lions Quest workshop	1	2	3	4-(9)	5-(21)	NA
2. Community Partner Panel	1	2-(1)	3	4-(9)	5-(21)	NA
3. Sustainability/Resources	1	2-(2)	3-(3)	4-(15)	5-(13)	NA
4. LSA Grant requirements	1	2	3-(3)	4-(10)	5-(19)	NA
5. Financial Management & Reporting	1	2-(2)	3-(3)	4-(11)	5-(16)	NA
6. Meeting facility	1-(1)	2	3-(3)	4-(9)	5-(18)	NA
7. General Satisfaction	1	2	3(1)	4-(9)	5-(21)	NA

8. What part of the meeting was most valuable to you?

Partnerships

Lions Quest Workshop
 Learning about the meth problem
 financial & it was too short
 1,2,&5
 Service Learning
 Finance
 interaction with others
 community partner panel
 Lions Quest & Community Partner Panel
 Networking!
 Having everything laid out
 impressive presenters
 Service Learning Skills, & review of requirements, expectations, etc.
 Overview of programs
 The Lion's Quest Training
 Workshop on 14th partner panel & resources on 15th
 Lion Quest & L&S Grant requirements
 Grant Requirements Lions Quest Workshop
 Everything was awesome-Great & valuable info
 The Lions Quest Workshop
 Networking, learning the basics, and the other opportunities that are available.

Grant requirements reviewed
Lions Quest workshop-although a very long day!
Information on implementation

9. How would you improve this meeting? What recommendations would you
have for next year's Institute?

Meeting room on Wednesday extremely warm
Larger room than at Holiday Inn
Time 8:00-3:00
A little lengthy second day but necessary
Maybe some more examples of actual projects
Large meeting room
Lighter lunches
Cold drinks/snacks at break
More moving around
No night dinner meeting
It was great-nice balance of info & activity
shorter sessions or more breaks
Cooler room-2nd day
I would not do repeat overviews during a 2 day workshop-some stuff covered we already know!
Example (flowchart twice in one day!)
set temp in room to reflect weather outside
Do not work through supper. That was not effective. We needed that down time. People were
not listening. Room temperature-too warm-Try to meet at same facility both days.
more comfortable seating arrangement for Lions Quest Workshop
maybe split up into groups of what each person does (admin of grant, program director of grant
financial director, etc.
having materials (notebooks) for everyone so we can follow along
more detailed partner information
I thought the conference was very helpful maybe look at splitting the group at times to cover
different topics
meeting was very long
yesterday was too much too long-after traveling 21/2 hrs (leaving at 6:30am)-and then a full day
with few breaks was exhausting-after such ?-productivity decreases and enthusiasm ?-I know
you needed to provide much info but 14 straight hours was excruciating and unrealistic even for
us super heroes

10. What other information, resources, and/or technical assistance do you need?

**Maybe split the group so those needing to cover the financial reporting can cover
everything in a little more detail
more knowledge on the actual meth drug-how it looks-warning signs etc.**

11. Any additional comments that would help Volunteer Tennessee better accommodate and/or
serve you in future events?

This was excellent-Thanks
It was great
great seminar
Good Job

Thanks!
I enjoyed it
Keep up the good work!
The financial info should have been earlier-by pm last thing of a 2-day program-no retention.
This was great
Thank you!
Thanks volunteer TN!
Thank you it was a very good training!
Thanks so much for the work that you are doing to make our communities strong!
I feel a part of a great team & have made some wonderful contacts.
more info in the actual meth-we cannot conduct service-learning if we do not have the
knowledge of what we are teaching

THANK YOU FOR YOUR GREAT WORK WITH TENNESSEE'S YOUTH

Service-Learning Symposium
Nashville, TN
May 10-11, 2007
Evaluation



Please rate the following on a scale of 1-5 (5 being the highest).

Overall satisfaction with the event	1	2	3	4-3	5-4
Participants' presentation	1	2	3	4-3	5-4
Meeting Facilities	1	2	3	4-2	5-5
Food	1	2	3-3	4-1	5-3
Lodging	1	2	3	4	5
Materials	1	2	3	4-4	5-3

Additional comments to elaborate on the topics presented above:

- I thought everything was excellent
- The topics were covered well. I appreciate the activities to loosen up the crowd and keep us attentive.
- Over-all I though the entire conference was well organized and well presented... from the facilities to the food.

1. What was the most valuable aspect of the symposium?

- Hearing the hearts of the those who made their presentations. Learning the creativity that went into each project. Obtaining valuable, practical information and ideas.
- Learning what the other programs were doing and getting new ideas
- The ideas that others shared and displayed were a great help. The information concerning budgets that was reviewed and the Q&A time were also a great benefit.
- I loved the children that came and shared their stories during out lunch. It really makes me feel we are making a difference.
- Reviewing presentations of other sites
- The time to share with other grantees.

2. What was the least valuable aspect of the symposium? What would you have left out?

- Again, everything was wonderful
 - I don't know of anything I would have left out
 - Not sure I would have left out anything really... I believe it was all relevant.
3. What would you change about the symposium? What needs to be added?
- Nothing, everything was fine
 - There must have been a lot of thought put into the symposium because it worked great!
 - It would have helped me personally if it would have been scheduled at a time other than when the 21st Century Grant Conference was going on. It was a little difficult covering them both at the same time. I don't believe anything was missing so I wouldn't really add anything else.
4. What other information, resources, and/or technical assistance do you need?
- Maybe a section devoted to first time grantees, that may need a little more explanation on the program
 - Anything to do with parent involvement would be helpful
 - Age appropriate resources
 - Thought it was all great!
5. How can Volunteer Tennessee and your program evaluators support you better in training and technical assistance?
- Same as #4, especially to Faith-based organizations
 - For community based/after-school programs we could use some on line resources for training our tutors, especially when you are in a small rural area where agencies that provide training are limited
 - It's nice to know who the evaluators are and how we can contact them directly
6. What suggestions do you have for the Service-Learning Institute this fall?
- Keep up the good work
 - Age appropriate teaching strategies
 - It was nice to be on-site without traveling to other locations
 - I have none, believe it or not
7. Do you have any suggestions for ways to improve *Clues & News*?
- I do not have anything to improve it. It is a wonderful tool
 - Once again I have none
8. Are there any additional comments that you would like to add to your evaluation that would help Volunteer Tennessee better accommodate and/or serve you in future events?
- Thanks for the opportunity to allow Faith-based organizations to provide Service Learning activities and opportunities to the community. It is our mission to disciple others and this adds a new element to what we already do.

- The meeting facilities were excellent-service was great.. Please try to keep our facilities in this capacity and things will go well. Thank you for all your hard work!
- The symposium was wonderful. None of the sessions were without merit. Since I am not from Nashville it was nice to have all meetings at hotel. Thanks for all you do!
- I am thrilled to have the opportunity to work with such wonderful, caring individuals. I appreciate the heart of each of the team members and the patience they have shown to me during the "learning period." I believe that their investment in the service learning program will not only benefit the children and staff involved in the program personally, but the entire State of Tennessee. KEEP UP THE GREAT JOB!!!