

12-2005

Assessing the Impact of the KIDS Consortium KIDS Living Democracy and First Year KIDSCAN Programs: First Year Findings

Center for Youth and Communities

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceprojectsummaries>

 Part of the [Service Learning Commons](#)

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Center for Youth and Communities, "Assessing the Impact of the KIDS Consortium KIDS Living Democracy and First Year KIDSCAN Programs: First Year Findings" (2005). *Project Summaries*. 12. <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceprojectsummaries/12>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Service Learning and Community Engagement Examples at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Project Summaries by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

Assessing the Impact of the KIDS Consortium KIDS Living Democracy and First Year KIDSCAN Programs: First Year Findings

Presented To
KIDS Consortium

Presented By
**Center for Youth and Communities
Heller School for Social Policy and Management
Brandeis University**

December 2005



Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
Methods	2
Results	4
Implications	10
Tabular Results	12

Introduction

KIDS Consortium is a New England based non-profit organization that works with teachers, administrators and students to involve students in addressing real challenges faced by their communities. It provides tools and training around its *KIDS As Planners* service-learning model for educators and community organizations, and conducts student Apprentice Citizenship leadership programs. Together teachers and students identify, research, and work to address local community needs. KIDS provides funding, guidance and training to teachers who match community projects to school curricula, with the ultimate goal of promoting positive outcomes for students, teachers, schools and communities.

KIDS Consortium (KIDS) received two separate grants from the Corporation for National and Community Service and the Maine Department of Education to organize and support schools involved in two programs funded through the Corporation's Learn and Serve program. The first of these, KIDSCAN, provides sub-grants to districts that incorporate the KIDS model into schools in the New England region. In the second program, Living Democracy, three states (Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island) joined together in a consortium to promote the integration of service-learning with civics and history instruction. Under that grant, teachers in the three states use the KIDS curriculum, but also participate in an annual training and receive on-going support to integrate civics and history curricula into the existing KIDS model. At the state level, the three Living Democracy states also committed to working to develop supportive state policies and curriculum resources.

KIDS Consortium has partnered with Brandeis University to evaluate both of these programs using a common set of tools and procedures. The goals of the evaluation for both programs are: (a) to assess the implementation of the programs and provide formative feedback for the purpose of program improvement; and (b) to assess the impacts of the programs on participating students, schools, and community partners.

This report is a part of that overall evaluation. This report presents Year 1 results, based on data collected from student and teacher post-program surveys that were administered at schools operating Living Democracy programs and first-year KIDSCAN programs. The surveys were designed to provide an initial assessment of the first year of implementation for both programs with the understanding that during the 2005-2006 school year (Year 2 of the evaluation), these sites would participate in a more extensive study, including participation in a pre/post/comparison group evaluation design. Results from this year's surveys are detailed in the attached tables. The report that follows is organized into three sections: a discussion of the methods used in the study; a summary of the study findings, including survey results, teacher focus groups, and interviews with state coordinators; and a brief conclusion.

Methods

During Year 1, post-program surveys were administered to participants in 16 Living Democracy and first-year KIDSCAN "mentee" classrooms in Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Vermont. Nine of these sites implemented only the Living Democracy curriculum, 4 sites implemented only the KIDSCAN curriculum, and 3 sites implemented both the KIDSCAN and Living Democracy curriculum (see Exhibit 1). Participating teachers were required to take part in the study as a condition of their grant. End-of-

program surveys were distributed to the sites in late spring, 2005, and administered and returned to Brandeis in May/June 2005. Each site was instructed to administer the survey to at least one classroom of program participants (approximately 25-30 students) chosen at random. All sixteen sites participated in the survey, returning a total of 374 student surveys, approximately 71% of all students in the classrooms participating in the study.

The surveys used in this study were post-only surveys, designed to parallel the content of the pre/post surveys used in the assessment of more experienced KIDSCAN sites (reported in a separate document). The surveys were designed to assess self-reported gains across three domains: academic development, civic development and social development. To do this, students were asked to agree or disagree with a series of statements about how their attitudes, skills or behaviors had changed as a result of their involvement their project in the community. The surveys also asked participants to assess the quality of their program experience and to retrospectively assess the degree to which their civic skills (for example, ability to find information, work in teams, or present information) changed over the course of the program period. The domains, sub-domains and numbers of questions within each are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Survey Domains, Sub Domains and Question Items

Domains	Sub-Domains	Numbers of Items
Academic	1. Education Aspirations	3
	2. Importance of Understanding History	3
	3. School Engagement	10
Civic	4. Civic Empowerment	5
	5. Civic Knowledge	4
	6. Future Civic Involvement	4
	7. Social Responsibility	2
Social/Personal	8. Belonging	3
	9. Caring Adult	2
	10. Personal Empowerment	4
Program Experience	Ratings of Experience in Program	11
Skills Gained	Ratings of Skills Gained in Program	17

Because of the post-only nature of the surveys, the primary results are frequencies for each question, i.e., the proportion of respondents who agreed or disagreed for each item in the surveys and/or mean domain scores (the average "score" or response for the questions in each domain). However, we also conducted t-tests to determine whether there were significant differences between student outcomes of those participating in the Living Democracy classes versus those participating in the KIDS CAN classes. We also conducted t-tests to determine whether there were differences in student outcomes based on the classroom processes teachers reported using with their students (e.g., duration of the program, use of KIDS model activities, etc.). The results are summarized in the results section and detailed in the "Tabular Results" attached to this summary.

In order to document issues regarding the implementation of the Living Democracy program, we conducted focus groups with coordinators and teachers from the three Living Democracy states, and

observed several KIDS Consortium training meetings (including the 2004 and 2005 Summer Institutes). Themes that emerged from these interviews and observations are discussed in the next section.

Finally, one of the goals of the Living Democracy program is to support policy and curriculum improvements at the state level to better support the integration of civics and history with service-learning. In order to learn more about those state-level activities, we conducted year-end interviews with the coordinators in the three Living Democracy states (Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island). Summaries of those interviews are included in the final section of the report.

Results

Overall, the first year data for the Living Democracy and “mentee” KIDSCAN sites indicate that the programs were successfully implemented across the majority of sites and, while the data are based on student self-report, the large majority of students reported gains in their civic, academic, and social attitudes and skills. Feedback from participating teachers through focus group discussions was also positive. Teachers were generally enthusiastic about the KIDS programs and felt that they had received adequate support and training both from KIDS Consortium and locally. At the same time, teachers noted the challenges of “putting all the pieces together” and of reconciling the emphasis on student leadership with the need to address pre-established state curriculum standards. Finally, at the state level, all three states report early efforts to establish working groups to address the linkage between service-learning and civics and history education, though all three also report challenges in moving forward.

Survey Data: Program Implementation

As part of the survey process, the evaluation team asked teachers to provide basic descriptive information on the implementation of the program through a set of “teacher cover sheets” that accompanied the student surveys. The cover sheet data provide a basic overview of where and how the program took place.

Based on the cover sheet data, two thirds of the participating students were in middle school (grades 6-8), with roughly half the sites and 40% of the participants concentrated in the 8th grade. The remaining third of the students were in high school, primarily ninth grade. Sixty percent of the programs took place in social studies classes, with another 20% in science courses. The remainder were in math, electives, and “other” types of classes (Exhibit 1).

Participant survey data indicates that students ranged in age from 10 to 18 years old with 81% between the ages of 13 and 15. The average participant was 13.7 years old. Fifty-one percent of the survey respondents were boys and 49% were girls. The large majority of participants (81%) were White; Asian and African-American students each represented 9% of the respondents, and Hispanic/Latino students represented 7%. A relatively large proportion (6%) were Native American (Exhibit 1, Demographics).

The cover sheet data indicate that most sites implemented the major elements of the program, though there was substantial variation in the time invested in project activities among the sites. Fifteen of the sixteen sites reported conducting a project in the community, one of the fundamental requirements of the program, with the time spent on the projects ranging from 4 to 26 weeks (mean of 9.7 weeks, median was 6

weeks). On average, teachers reported that students spent 31 hours in program activities: 22 hours in class and 9 hours of out-of-class time, or an average of approximately 3 hours per week over a roughly 10 week period.

Projects were generally organized as small group or whole class projects (42% and 50% respectively), with only one site reporting individual student projects. Most sites (86%) reported that the projects were adult-guided, generally indicating an effort to balance student leadership with the need for the teacher to set a broad direction for the class. Only 1 site reported student-directed projects, and only 1 reported that projects were adult directed.

Finally, the majority of sites reported involving students in a variety of the “quality” activities included in the KIDS model. Most sites (81%) reported involving the community in the planning process, and 75% shared the results of the projects publicly. Sixty percent of the sites or more reported using reflection, evaluating how well the project met a community need, doing activities to learn about collaboration, developing a work plan and discussing the link between the project and the class’ learning goals. Fewer than half of the sites, however, reported conducting research on community problems or conducting surveys or interviews as part of the research process (44%). Overall, approximately one third of the sites reported conducting most elements in the model (8 or 9 of the key activities); roughly 66% of the sites reported doing more than half (6 or more). (Cover sheet data are reported in Exhibits 2-6.)

A major goal of the Living Democracy program is to help students make the connection between service and key issues in American history and government, and sites were encouraged to do so through the use of historical documents in their program. Among the Living Democracy sites, half reported using historical documents as part of their projects; half also reported that they had discussed voting as part of their projects. The fact that half of the Living Democracy sites did not use historical documents raises the question of whether the sites used alternative means of making the history connections or failed to adequately address that aspect of the program model. This is an area that will be pursued by the program in the Year 2 training and technical assistance process.

Overall, we found students in the KIDS programs were satisfied with their experiences in the program. As Table 2a shows, 83% of students rated their experiences positively. When asked about more specific aspects of the program, the large majority reported a positive program experience:

- Over 80% of the participants reported that they had a chance to discuss and research the problem before taking action; felt the problem that they worked on was important; felt like they had real responsibilities; felt they made a difference; completed all the steps that they planned on their project; and worked with their teacher to assess what they had learned (see Table 2b).
- More than 60% reported having a say in choosing the project, meeting with people in the community, and learning about how the project was related to local history.
- Half reported learning about how the project was related to issues in American history, and 58% reported wanting to continue work on the issue, either on their own or through another class.

Not surprisingly, in comparison to the KIDSCAN students, students in the Living Democracy classrooms were significantly more likely to say that they learned about how their projects were related to the history of their community and how their projects were related to documents or issues in American history.

Living Democracy students were also somewhat more likely to say that they felt the problem they worked on was important (although the vast majority of both groups said that they felt the problems they worked on were important); that their teachers worked with them to assess their learning; and that they wanted to continue working on their project issue. Overall, however, both groups reported a positive program experience.

Survey Data: Participant Outcomes

On most measures of students' academic, civic and social outcomes surveyed in the study, the majority of participants reported gains: on 30 of 40 questions in the core section of the survey, 60% or more of the students reported gains, and 50% or more of participants reported gains on all but two of the questions (see Tables 3 – 12). Looking across the domains, participants were most likely to agree that the programs had increased their educational aspirations and their sense of personal empowerment (average domain scores of 3.30 and 3.02 respectively). They were least likely to report getting to know a caring adult as a result of involvement in the program (domain score of 2.42).¹

Responses to individual questions also help to highlight some areas in which participants most frequently reported gains, including gains in education aspirations, school engagement, and a variety of civic attitudes and skills. For example:

- Eighty percent or more of the participants reported that, as a result of their experience in the program, they were more sure they wanted to graduate high school and complete a college degree; that they worked harder in school and believed that school was important; that they were more likely to vote in national elections; and that they were more likely to take action on causes they believe in.
- Seventy percent or more reported being surer they wanted to attend college; learning that it is important to understand this history behind a community problem; that they believe they can make a difference in their community; and learning how to design a project and how to influence decisions in their community. Seventy percent or more also reported that they are more likely to get information about candidates and issues before voting, and that it is important for everyone to be concerned about community issues.

On a few measures, Living Democracy students reported significantly better outcomes than their KIDSCAN peers. For example, Living Democracy students were more likely to say that they have a better understanding of their town's services, learned it is important to understand the history behind a community problem before trying to solve it, are more likely to take action on causes they believe in, and are more interested in learning as much as they can about their school subjects. On most measures, however, similar proportions of students reported gains.

Students also made significant gains on the measures of civic skills used in the survey. Students were asked rate how well they could do a series of tasks related to civic engagement at the beginning and

¹ The domain scores are the average of participant responses to the questions in each of the ten subdomains listed in Table 1 (educational aspirations, civic empowerment, etc.). Students were asked to indicate the degree to which each statement was true or not true for them, with a scale from 1 (Not true at all) to 4 (Very true for me). Higher domain scores indicate agreement that gains took place as a result of the program.

end of the year, including skills related to identifying and researching community issues, planning and managing community projects, working in teams, and communicating results. Half or more of the students reported making gains on 11 of 17 of the retrospective questions regarding their project management, research, and communication skills (see Table 13). Overall, students' average skill rating improved significantly on all 17 skills ($p = .001$).

Finally, one of the key questions for the study was the degree to which program practice was associated with the participant reported outcomes: did sites that provided longer or more intensive program experiences (duration, hours in and out of class) or that implemented most of the key elements of the program model show significantly better outcomes than those that did not. To address this question, we examined the differences in outcomes for several subgroups of programs.

The key finding was that, in most cases, programs that provided a stronger program experience produced significantly stronger outcomes. Specifically, programs that had one or more of the following characteristics had significantly better participant outcomes: longer duration programs (6 weeks or longer), more program hours (at least 24 combined in-class and out-of-class hours), used small group projects (versus whole class projects), followed the KIDS model (using six or more "quality" activities such as reflection, collaboration, developing a work plan, and creating clear links to learning goals). In short, these initial data tend to reinforce the common wisdom that program quality makes a difference. In the same vein, classes taught by teachers experienced with service-learning (having at least 2.5 years of experience) also tended to have significantly better results (see Exhibits 2-7). While KIDS Consortium cannot control the experience level of the teachers involved in service-learning, the finding does suggest that as teachers gain experience, their outcomes improve, and that retaining and supporting experienced service-learning teachers is one route to promoting positive outcomes.

As noted above, only half of the Living Democracy sites reported using historical documents as part of their projects (see Exhibit 4). There was no difference in student outcomes between those sites that reported using historical documents and those that did not. However, the surveys did not ask how teachers used historical documents, and it is possible that at least some of the classes that used historical documents did not use them in ways that would lead to measurable differences in students' outcomes.

In summary, the early survey results suggest that the KIDS programs were well-implemented across most sites and that they had a positive impact in terms of promoting a variety of important youth outcomes, including positive civic, academic, and social skills and attitudes. Moreover, the differences in outcomes between sites reinforces the idea that the quality of implementation matters: stronger programs tend to produce better outcomes.

Focus Group and Meeting Observation Results

In order to supplement the survey data and gain a better understanding of the issues involved in implementing the Living Democracy and KIDSCAN programs, Brandeis staff attended several of the KIDS Consortium training sessions and conferences and, at several of those meetings, conducted brief focus group discussions with the participating teachers. In most cases, the discussions took place at Living

Democracy program meetings and focused on the Living Democracy program; however, several discussions with KIDSCAN sites also took place.

Several themes emerged from the focus groups and KIDS Consortium meetings. Living Democracy is generally regarded positively by coordinators and teachers. Recipients reported that the three-year grant gives them time for planning, implementing, and achieving systemic change. Most seem satisfied with the training provided by KIDS Consortium. Overall, teachers that attended the Summer Institutes returned to their schools and districts excited and ready to implement new ideas with their students. Some sites noted that the increased emphasis on making policy connections changed their way of thinking about service-learning.

Teachers also noted that they are experiencing great pressure to meet state learning standards. Some teachers found Living Democracy fit their state's learning standards well, while others found it more difficult to make the connections or to create the space for service-learning activities in their already-crowded curriculum. The need for classroom activities to support learning standards may have affected whether projects were student-led. Students were involved in leading projects in some but not all sites. In some cases, service-learning coordinators and/or teachers felt that they needed to develop the projects in order to ensure that the projects aligned with the state standards they hoped to address and their curriculum goals. In other projects teachers opted to let students lead, but struggled with the task of making the connections with the content of the curriculum that they had to teach.

Teachers and coordinators reported that having sufficient leadership support and planning time are important. Securing the involvement and support of school leaders (e.g., social studies department chair, principal, superintendent) helped some sites get teachers involved and make service-learning a priority. The push to create a leadership teams was a useful step in that regard. In addition to having leadership support, having sufficient teacher planning time, and particularly common planning time in team-teacher-led projects, was reported to be important but sometimes difficult to find.

Other themes emerged regarding how the projects were conducted. The major challenge, in many sites, was putting all of the pieces together: that is, successfully combining service, civics and history. For example, a number of projects were linked to the 2004 presidential election. In those cases, there was a clear connection to civics and public policy (importance of voting, discussion of issues) but not necessarily a connection to historical documents/civic history. In other cases, the service component of the project was not altogether clear – projects represented solid project-based learning, but the element of service to the community was not as well developed. Although many sites struggled to integrate history, civics and service, some sites were able to make a strong connection between a contemporary issue and the historical context, and include a meaningful community service component.

Finally, teachers and coordinators across the sites spoke positively of the support they received from KIDS Consortium. As noted above, the training sessions and conferences were seen as promoting new ideas and activities, and the on-site assistance provided by KIDS Consortium staff was seen as a valuable source of support.

In summary, teachers and coordinators found great value in the KIDS Consortium programs. The Living Democracy programs continue to work to find ways to integrate service learning with

history/civics, use historical documents, and both Living Democracy and KIDSCAN sites reported benefiting from the KIDS Consortium support.

State-Level Policy and Curriculum Development

While the major focus of the Living Democracy program is on the implementation of the program at the classroom level, the program is also designed to build support for the integration of service-learning into civics and social studies at the state level. Under the grant, each of the three states is expected to establish state-level working groups and to develop strategies for increased policy and/or curriculum support for the link between service-learning and history and civics. In order to assess progress on this aspect of the program, the Brandeis evaluation team conducted year-end interviews with the project coordinators in each of the three states.

Several themes emerged from interviews conducted with the three state coordinators regarding the extent to which the Living Democracy program has thus far had an impact on education policy and practice at the state level. In general, all three states report efforts to establish working groups and to begin to build support for new policies supporting the link between service-learning and civics or social studies education. At the same time, in all three states, the state-level work has been complicated (and in some cases, aided) by the emergence of other groups working on civic education issues and by changes in staffing and departmental organization. The result is that efforts have begun in all three states, but there is substantial work to be done.

Based on the interviews with the state coordinators, the process of creating policy change at the state level is ongoing. All three report that it has taken time to determine who should be at the table and to build stakeholders' awareness and interest. Approaches currently underway include lobbying for a state-funded position in social studies/civic education (ME), incorporating service-learning into other professional development provided by the state department of education (under consideration in MA), and creating new state civic education standards for K-12 (RI). Massachusetts' service-learning coordinator has also begun to promote improved integration of civic education into service-learning by requiring all prospective Learn & Serve grantees to explain how their service-learning proposal enhances students' civic education and citizenship.

All three coordinators feel that the Living Democracy grant has helped to influence and accelerate change at the state level by raising awareness among state education leaders and, to some degree, helping to shape or focus an agenda. In all three states, the Living Democracy grants complement other efforts underway (e.g., the Maine Task Force on Citizenship Education, the MA Community Service Learning Advisory Council, the RI Permanent Commission on Civic Education). In two of these cases (Maine and Rhode Island), these other efforts are driven by legislative efforts to investigate and promote civic education. In that regard, Living Democracy is seen as fitting in with a broader effort to build support for civics or citizenship education. One result is that state department of education leaders in both Maine and Massachusetts are now saying that schools need to prepare students for citizenship in addition to preparing them for further education and employment.

At the same time, progress on specific Living Democracy-related activities has been slow. The study groups vary in terms of their stage of development and goals. Study groups from Maine and Massachusetts have begun to meet, while Rhode Island's is still forming. All three are currently or plan to collect best practices in civic education. In both Maine and Massachusetts, the study group's formation and purpose was affected by other existing or recently formed task forces/councils with related mandates. In Maine, the Living Democracy study group became the best practices subcommittee of the Maine's Task Force on Citizenship Education (which is funded by the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools). In Massachusetts, there has been some confusion about what the study group's role should be in relation to the state's Community Service Learning Advisory Council. As a result, while the group has met, issues of role and coordination still need to be worked out.

The state coordinators also noted a number of barriers to influencing state policy/practice that have slowed or limited progress at the state level. These have included competing demands on educators' plates, tight state funding, lack of leadership from within the state department of education, and lack of support to implement already-passed policies (e.g., resources to support RI's new service student graduation requirement, resources for the RI department of education to create the legislatively-mandated social studies standards). All three states have also experienced turnover or changes in the state coordinators positions, with new staff coming in during the past year in Maine and Massachusetts, and a change in the funding and focus of the position in Rhode Island. The message implicit in all of these discussions is that it is likely that building policy support will likely take time and a sustained effort. Given the experience gained during the past year of work, it may make sense for the state coordinators to attempt to define a few, common state-level outcomes so that they can focus their efforts and possibly find some ways of working together to further leverage their time and resources.

Conclusions

These results represent the first of two years of data collection at the Living Democracy and the KIDSCAN "mentee" sites. They suggest that the service-learning and community planning activities found within the KIDS Consortium classrooms can have a positive influence on the education engagement and civic development of middle and high school students. They also indicate that the quality of implementation can make a difference in students' outcomes. Next year will provide an opportunity to examine the relative impact of these Living Democracy and KIDSCAN programs in comparison to students who are not involved in service-learning activities through use of a pre/post/comparison group study design.

Perhaps the most significant issue identified in the course of the first year evaluation has been the difficulty experienced by Living Democracy sites in particular in "putting all the pieces together," that is, in finding the right mix of student leadership, meaningful service, and solid links to the broader issues of civics and American history. These issues have been identified in discussions with KIDS Consortium staff, and the professional development plans for the program have been adjusted to focus more support on these issues. Similarly, efforts to build policy support at the state level have been difficult to implement – not a surprise given the challenges of working at the state policy level. However, all three states recognize the need to continue to work in this area.

**** DRAFT ****

Overall, the findings for the initial year of implementation at both the Living Democracy and KIDSCAN sites are positive and encouraging. The second year of the evaluation will continue to document both the implementation and the outcomes of both sets of programs.

Tabular Results

Exhibit 1. Demographics

KIDSCAN or Living Democracy site

KIDSCAN only sites	4 sites (25%)
Living Democracy sites	12 sites (75%)
Living Democracy only	9 sites (56%)
Living Democracy and KIDSCAN	3 sites (19%)

Type of class (note: percentages add to greater than 100% since some teachers indicated they taught more than one class)

Social studies	10 sites (63%)
Science	3 sites (19%)
Math	1 site (6%)
Elective	2 sites (13%)
Other	2 sites (13%)

Did project in community

Yes	15 sites (94%)
No	1 site (6%)

Grade levels

	% of All Students	# of Sites
6 th grade	15%	3 sites
7 th grade	10%	3 sites
8 th grade	43%	8 sites
9 th grade	30%	4 sites
10 th grade	<1%	--
11 th grade	1%	1 site
12 th grade	1%	1 site

Age

	All Students n = 374
10	<1%
11	3%
12	13%
13	24%
14	34%
15	23%
16	1%
17	1%
18	1%

Race/Ethnicity (students could indicate more than one)

	All Students
American Indian or Alaskan Native	6%
Asian	9%
Black or African-American	9%
Franco-American	4%
Hispanic/Latino	7%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	4%
White	81%

Gender

	All Students
Boy	51%
Girl	49%

Survey Completion

Number of participants in group

Mean:	33
Median:	26
Range:	6 – 125
Total:	529

Number of participants who completed surveys

Mean:	23
Median:	25
Range:	6 – 35
Total:	374

Overall completion rate: 71%

Survey completion dates: 5/9/05 to 6/14/05

Table 2a. Students' Rating of Their Project Experience

Rating of experience	All Students n = 374	Living Democracy n = 301	KIDSCAN n = 73
Excellent + Good	83%	84%	80%
Excellent	34%	32%	45%
Good	49%	52%	35%
Fair	15%	14%	20%
Poor	2%	3%	--

Table 2b. Students' Description of Their Project Experience

Ques #		All Students			Living Democracy ²			KIDSCAN		
		Very True	Sort of True	True ³	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
2a	I had a say in choosing the problem or need that I worked on.	39%	29%	67%	39%	27%	66%	38%	35%	72%
2b	I had a chance to discuss or research the problem or need before I took action.	57%	31%	88%	58%	29%	87%	54%	38%	92%
2c	I met with or worked with people or organizations in the community in order to learn more about the problem.	31%	32%	62%	28%	33%	62%	41%	24%	65%
2d	I learned about how my project was related to the history of my community.*	30%	34%	64%	32%	33%	65%	21%	38%	58%
2e	I learned about how my project was related to documents or issues in American history (such as the Constitution or civil rights).**	29%	22%	51%	35%	22%	57%	9%	19%	27%
2f	I felt like the problem I worked on was important.*	64%	27%	92%	67%	25%	93%	53%	34%	87%
2g	I felt like I had real responsibilities on my project.	47%	39%	87%	47%	40%	87%	50%	36%	86%
2h	I completed all the steps on my project that I had planned.	55%	34%	89%	57%	33%	89%	51%	37%	87%
2i	I felt like my project made a difference.	46%	38%	84%	48%	36%	84%	37%	45%	82%
2j	My teacher worked with me to assess what I had learned through the project.**	43%	37%	80%	46%	37%	83%	33%	37%	70%
2k	I want to continue working on this issue, either on my own or with another class at school.*	26%	31%	58%	29%	30%	59%	17%	36%	53%

² Living Democracy includes students from sites that are Living Democracy Only and sites that are both KIDSCAN and Living Democracy. KIDSCAN includes students from KIDSCAN only sites.

³ "True" total may be different than the sum of "Very True" and "Sort of True" due to rounding.

**** DRAFT ****

* Difference between KIDSCAN and Living Democracy students is significant at the 0.05 level.
**Difference between KIDSCAN and Living Democracy students is significant at the 0.01 level.

ACADEMIC RESULTS

Table 3. Education Aspirations

Ques #		All Students n = 374			Living Democracy n = 301			KIDSCAN n = 73		
		Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
5ii	I am more sure that I want to graduate high school.	65%	16%	81%	64%	17%	80%	71%	10%	81%
5jj	I am more sure that I want to attend college.	62%	16%	78%	61%	17%	78%	68%	10%	78%
5kk	I am more sure that I want to complete college and get a degree.	62%	18%	80%	61%	20%	80%	67%	9%	76%
	Average Domain Score ⁴			3.30			3.30			3.33

Table 4. Importance of Understanding History

Ques #		All Students			Living Democracy			KIDSCAN		
		Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
5f	I learned that it is important to understand the history behind a community problem before you try to solve it.**	34%	37%	72%	37%	38%	75%	24%	34%	58%
5p	I know how to find information on the history of my community.	23%	32%	55%	22%	33%	56%	24%	26%	50%
5ff	I learned that you can improve a community project by looking at how people tried to solve community problems in the past.	26%	35%	61%	26%	36%	62%	27%	30%	57%
	Average Domain Score			2.75			2.78			2.60

**Difference between KIDSCAN and Living Democracy students is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

⁴ Domain scores are based on the response scale and run from 1 (Not True at All) to 4 (Very True for Me).

Table 5. School Engagement

Ques #		All Students n = 374			Living Democracy n = 301			KIDSCAN n = 73		
		Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
5d	I don't work as hard in school. (REVERSE CODED) ⁵	61%	23%	84%	63%	22%	85%	56%	24%	80%
5i	I am more interested in learning as much as I can about my school subjects.*	22%	38%	60%	24%	38%	62%	14%	39%	53%
5o	I pay more attention in class at school.	28%	31%	59%	29%	31%	60%	24%	31%	55%
5q	I don't try as hard at school. (REVERSE CODED)	64%	19%	83%	63%	19%	82%	69%	17%	86%
5s	Teachers gave me a chance to explore topics I found interesting.	31%	32%	62%	31%	32%	63%	31%	31%	62%
5bb	I feel happier when I am in school.	15%	31%	46%	16%	32%	48%	9%	28%	37%
5dd	I work much harder on my schoolwork.	27%	26%	53%	27%	29%	56%	25%	13%	39%
5gg	It is very important to me to do the best I can in school.	56%	25%	81%	56%	25%	81%	57%	25%	82%
5hh	I had opportunities to decide for myself what I learned about in school.	29%	38%	67%	31%	39%	69%	24%	34%	58%
5ll	I try harder when I am in class at school.	37%	31%	68%	38%	32%	70%	31%	28%	59%
	Average Domain Score			2.89			2.92			2.77

* Difference between KIDSCAN and Living Democracy students is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

⁵ Reverse coded means that students' answers were coded in reverse to match the positively-worded format of the rest of the questions in this domain (i.e., answers to this question of "Not true at all" were coded as "Very true," answers of "Not very true" were coded as "Sort of true," answers of "Sort of true" were coded as "Not very true," and answers of "Very true" were coded as "Not true at all").

CIVIC RESULTS

Table 6. Civic Empowerment

Ques #		All Students n = 374			Living Democracy n = 301			KIDSCAN n = 73		
		Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
5e	I believe that I can make a difference in my school or community.	37%	42%	79%	38%	42%	80%	32%	42%	75%
5j	I learned what is expected of a leader of a group project.	40%	30%	69%	40%	30%	70%	38%	28%	66%
5l	I feel more confident sharing my opinions in front of a group.	29%	40%	68%	29%	41%	69%	29%	36%	64%
5y	I learned how to design and do a project in my community.	39%	36%	74%	38%	36%	74%	42%	35%	77%
5cc	I started to believe that students my age can influence community decisions.	31%	34%	64%	31%	35%	66%	29%	29%	59%
	Average Domain Score			2.96			2.98			2.89

Table 7. Civic Knowledge

Ques #		All Students			Living Democracy			KIDSCAN		
		Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
5a	I learned how to influence the decisions that are made in my community	22%	49%	71%	23%	50%	72%	20%	47%	67%
5m	I have a better understanding of the different kinds of services my town provides to people in my community.**	26%	37%	63%	28%	37%	65%	16%	38%	54%
5r	When community issues or problems are being discussed, I am more likely to have something to say.	24%	34%	57%	22%	36%	58%	30%	24%	54%
5v	I am able to understand most community issues more easily.	23%	37%	60%	24%	36%	60%	19%	41%	60%
	Average Domain Score			2.74			2.76			2.61

**Difference between KIDSCAN and Living Democracy students is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 8. Future Civic Involvement

Ques #		All Students n = 374			Living Democracy n = 301			KIDSCAN n = 73		
		Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
5b	I am more likely to vote in national elections when I am an adult.	52%	28%	80%	53%	27%	80%	49%	30%	79%
5z	I am more likely to get information about candidates and issues before voting in an election when I am an adult.	44%	30%	74%	46%	28%	74%	38%	38%	77%
5mm	I am more likely to be active in civic organizations when I grow up, such as town committees or community organizations.	19%	35%	54%	19%	36%	55%	18%	32%	50%
5nn	I am more likely to volunteer or provide community service.	27%	35%	62%	26%	37%	62%	33%	27%	60%
	Average Domain Score			2.90			2.90			2.86

Table 9. Social Responsibility

Ques #		All Students			Living Democracy			KIDSCAN		
		Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
5k	I now believe that it is my responsibility to be actively involved in community issues.	26%	40%	65%	25%	40%	65%	28%	39%	68%
5w	I learned that it is important for everyone to be concerned about state and local issues.	36%	35%	71%	35%	37%	72%	39%	30%	69%
	Average Domain Score			2.90			2.89			2.92

SOCIAL RESULTS

Table 10. Belonging

Ques #		All Students			Living Democracy			KIDSCAN		
		Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
5n	I feel like I am an important part of my community.	22%	36%	59%	24%	37%	60%	17%	36%	54%
5t	I learned that adults in my community value my opinion.	20%	34%	54%	21%	32%	53%	17%	41%	58%
5u	I learned that you have to work with others if you want to solve community problems.	40%	37%	77%	39%	37%	76%	42%	36%	78%
	Average Domain Score			2.79			2.80			2.74

Table 11. Caring Adult

Ques #		All Students			Living Democracy			KIDSCAN		
		Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
5h	I got to know an adult who really cares about me.	19%	23%	41%	19%	24%	43%	19%	16%	34%
5aa	I got to know an adult who listens to me when I have something to say.	23%	32%	55%	23%	33%	56%	22%	28%	50%
	Average Domain Score			2.42			2.45			2.30

Table 12. Personal Empowerment

Ques #		All Students n = 374			Living Democracy n = 301			KIDSCAN n = 73		
		Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True	Very True	Sort of True	True
5c	I am more likely to take action on causes I believe in.*	46%	38%	84%	48%	38%	86%	38%	37%	75%
5g	I am more confident in my ability to do well.	35%	43%	77%	36%	43%	79%	28%	44%	72%
5x	I learned to accept responsibility for my actions.	40%	33%	73%	41%	33%	74%	38%	31%	69%
5ee	I learned how to seek solutions to complex problems.	24%	43%	67%	24%	44%	68%	21%	43%	63%
	Average Domain Score*			3.02			3.06			2.87

* Difference between KIDSCAN and Living Democracy students is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

**Table 13. Difference in Students' Skills from the Beginning of Year to End of Year
(as reported by students at the end of the year)**

Skill n = 371 (15-20% of students did not answer each of these questions)	Average rating for beginning of year	Average rating for end of year	Percent Mean Increase*	Percent of respondents whose skill increased (+)
Identify needs or problems important to community	2.08	2.76	33%	60%
Make phone calls or conduct interviews to gather information on community problem	1.88	2.41	28%	44%
Compare the pros and cons of different solutions to a community problem	2.41	2.97	23%	53%
Look at different ways to solve a community problem until you find a solution	2.25	2.80	24%	53%
Identify the steps that are important when a group needs to make a decision	2.45	3.03	24%	51%
Change what you are doing on a project to make it work better	2.45	3.02	23%	55%
Work on a team with other students to make decisions about a community problem	2.44	3.01	23%	53%
Make a presentation using charts, graphs, etc.	2.50	3.06	22%	53%
Decide what is important to think about in choosing a project	2.48	3.05	23%	52%
Identify people who need to be involved in a project	2.35	2.88	23%	47%
Manage your time so you can get all of the steps in a project done	2.42	2.96	22%	54%
Communicate your ideas about something you think is important	2.47	3.02	22%	53%
Set up a timeline and action steps for a project	2.24	2.73	22%	49%
Identify and use the skills that are needed to make a team work well together	2.55	3.06	20%	50%
Use several different kinds of sources to gather information on a community issue	2.56	3.08	20%	48%
Use single source of information to gather information on community problem	2.50	3.01	20%	46%
Work with other students in a group to improve the way you are working as a team	2.72	3.15	16%	44%

Ratings translate as follows: 1.0 = Not at All; 2.0 = A Little; 3.0 = Pretty Well; 4.0 = Very Well

*All mean differences are statistically significant at the .001 level.

Exhibit 2. Weeks Spent on Projects

Number of weeks teachers reported that their classes spent working on community project

Mean: 9.7 weeks
Median: 6.0 weeks
Range: 4 – 26 weeks

Difference in student outcomes by program duration: weeks (all students)

(comparison by domain of students whose teachers reported spending less than the median number of weeks [6.0 weeks] versus those whose teachers reported spending more than the median number of weeks)

Domain	Mean of <u>shorter</u> duration group (<6.0 weeks) (-)	Mean of <u>longer</u> duration group (≥6.0 weeks) (+)	Mean Difference	Statistical Significance
Education Aspirations	3.12	3.41	.29	**
Belonging	2.54	2.98	.44	***
Caring Adult	2.17	2.60	.43	***
Civic Empowerment	2.72	3.16	.44	***
Civic Knowledge	2.50	2.93	.43	***
Future Civic Involvement	2.67	3.07	.40	***
Importance of Understanding History	2.50	2.93	.43	***
Personal Empowerment	2.83	3.17	.34	***
School Engagement	2.71	3.00	.29	***
Social Responsibility	2.69	3.06	.37	***

Ratings translate as follows: 1.0 = Not True at All; 2.0 = Not Very True; 3.0 = Sort of True; 4.0 = Very True

**Mean difference is statistically significant at the .01 level.

***Mean difference is statistically significant at the .001 level.

ANALYSIS► Students involved in projects that lasted longer in weeks reported better outcomes than students in shorter projects, and the differences were statistically significant.

Exhibit 3. Hours Spent on Projects

Hours teachers reported that their classes spent working on community project

Total number of in-class hours per student

Mean: 22.2 hours
Median: 15.0 hours
Range: 1 – 78 hours

Total number of out-of-class hours per student

Mean: 9.0 hours
Median: 9.0 hours
Range: 0 – 40 hours

Total number of in & out-of-class hours per student

Mean: 31.2 hours
Median: 24 hours
Range: 3 – 80 hours

Difference in student outcomes by program duration: total in-class and out-of-class hours (all students)

(comparison by domain of students whose teachers reported spending less than the median number of in-class and out-of-class hours [24 hours] versus those whose teachers reported spending more than the median number of in-class and out-of-class hours)

Domain	Mean of <u>shorter</u> duration group (< 24 hours) (-)	Mean of <u>longer</u> duration group (≥ 24 hours) (+)	Mean Difference	Statistical Significance
Education Aspirations	3.15	3.37	.22	*
Belonging	2.58	2.92	.34	***
Caring Adult	2.20	2.54	.34	***
Civic Empowerment	2.81	3.05	.24	**
Civic Knowledge	2.58	2.82	.24	**
Future Civic Involvement	2.71	3.00	.29	***
Importance of Understanding History	2.67	2.72	.05	NA
Personal Empowerment	2.91	3.07	.16	*
School Engagement	2.78	2.92	.14	*
Social Responsibility	2.73	3.01	.28	**

Ratings translate as follows: 1.0 = Not True at All; 2.0 = Not Very True; 3.0 = Sort of True; 4.0 = Very True

*Mean difference is statistically significant at the .05 level

**Mean difference is statistically significant at the .01 level.

***Mean difference is statistically significant at the .001 level.

ANALYSIS► Students that spent more combined in- & out-of-class hours on service-learning projects reported better outcomes than students in classes with fewer hours, and the differences in

outcomes were statistically significant (with the exception of the "Importance of Understanding History" domain).

Exhibit 4. Use of Historical Documents

Living Democracy sites use of historical documents

Teachers who reported that they used historical documents as part of the project

Overall: 7 sites (44%)
Living Democracy sites⁶: 6 sites (50% of Living Democracy sites)

Teachers who reported that they discussed voting as part of the project

Overall: 8 sites (50%)
Living Democracy sites: 6 sites (50% of Living Democracy sites)

Did Living Democracy students report better outcomes if their teachers reported using historical documents as part of the projects? (Living Democracy only)

(comparison by domain of Living Democracy students whose teachers reported using historical documents versus those whose teachers reported they didn't)

Domain	Mean of <u>didn't</u> <u>use historical</u> <u>documents</u> group (-)	Mean of <u>did</u> <u>use historical</u> <u>documents</u> group (+)	Mean Difference	Statistical Significance
Education Aspirations	3.14	3.49	.35	**
Belonging	2.78	2.83	.05	NA
Caring Adult	2.40	2.44	.04	NA
Civic Empowerment	2.98	3.03	.05	NA
Civic Knowledge	2.73	2.83	.10	NA
Future Civic Involvement	2.83	3.01	.18	NA
Importance of Understanding History	2.75	2.84	.09	NA
Personal Empowerment	3.08	3.10	.02	NA
School Engagement	2.83	3.00	.17	*
Social Responsibility	2.86	2.90	.04	NA

Ratings translate as follows: 1.0 = Not True at All; 2.0 = Not Very True; 3.0 = Sort of True; 4.0 = Very True

*Mean difference is statistically significant at the .05 level

**Mean difference is statistically significant at the .01 level.

ANALYSIS► Generally not any significant differences. Although Living Democracy students in classes that used historical documents appeared to show slightly better outcomes in all domains, the results were only statistically significant in two domains (Educational Aspirations and School Engagement). Only half of the Living Democracy sites reported using historical documents (6 out of 12).

⁶ Living Democracy includes students from sites that are Living Democracy Only and sites that are both KIDSCAN and Living Democracy. KIDSCAN includes students from KIDSCAN only sites.

Exhibit 5. Use of KIDS as Planners Model: Project Organization

Use of KIDS as Planners Model

How teachers reported projects were organized

Individual projects: 1 site (7%)
Small group projects: 6 sites (43%)
Whole class projects: 7 sites (50%)

How teachers reported their students worked on project

Student-directed: 1 site (7%)
Adult-guided: 12 sites (86%)
Adult-directed: 1 site (7%)

Was there a difference in student outcomes by whether students completed projects as a whole class or as small groups? (all students)

(comparison by domain of students whose teachers reported whole class projects versus those whose teachers reported small group projects; omitted individual projects since there was only one site that used this model)

Domain	Mean of <u>whole</u> class project group (-)	Mean of <u>small</u> class project group (+)	Mean Difference	Statistical Significance
Education Aspirations	2.98	3.48	.50	***
Belonging	2.65	2.92	.27	**
Caring Adult	2.25	2.60	.35	**
Civic Empowerment	2.75	3.14	.39	***
Civic Knowledge	2.54	2.88	.34	***
Future Civic Involvement	2.65	3.06	.41	***
Importance of Understanding History	2.52	2.81	.29	**
Personal Empowerment	2.83	3.13	.30	***
School Engagement	2.70	3.00	.30	***
Social Responsibility	2.74	3.06	.32	***

Ratings translate as follows: 1.0 = Not True at All; 2.0 = Not Very True; 3.0 = Sort of True; 4.0 = Very True

**Mean difference is statistically significant at the .01 level.

***Mean difference is statistically significant at the .001 level.

ANALYSIS► Students completing projects in small groups reported better outcomes than those who completed whole class projects, and the differences were statistically significant.

Exhibit 6. Use of KIDS as Planners Model: "Quality" Activities

Number of sites whose teachers reported using the KIDS "quality" service-learning activities listed below (number of sites that performed each activity, in descending order)

Involve community in planning	13 sites (81%)
Share project's results	12 sites (75%)
Reflect throughout	11 sites (69%)
Evaluate how project addressed community need	11 sites (69%)
Do activities to learn how to collaborate	10 sites (63%)
Develop workplan	10 sites (63%)
Discuss link between project & learning goals	10 sites (63%)
Research community problems for project ideas	7 sites (44%)
Conduct active research (interviews/surveys)	7 sites (44%)

Combined number of activities sites conducted

0-1 activities	—
2-3 activities	3 (20%)
4-5 activities	2 (13%)
6-7 activities	5 (33%)
8-9 activities	5 (33%)

Median number of activities engaged in: 6.0

Difference in student outcomes by number of "quality" service-learning activities engaged in (all students)

(comparison by domain of students whose teachers reported using fewer than the median total number of "quality" service-learning activities [6] versus those whose teachers reported using more than the median number of activities)

Domain	Mean of <u>fewer</u> activities group (< 6 activities) (-)	Mean of <u>more</u> activities group (>= 6 activities) (+)	Mean Difference	Statistical Significance
Education Aspirations	3.01	3.40	.39	***
Belonging	2.47	2.91	.44	***
Caring Adult	2.12	2.51	.39	***
Civic Empowerment	2.63	3.10	.47	***
Civic Knowledge	2.40	2.87	.47	***
Future Civic Involvement	2.54	3.04	.50	***
Importance of Understanding History	2.51	2.80	.29	***
Personal Empowerment	2.77	3.11	.34	***
School Engagement	2.67	2.94	.27	***
Social Responsibility	2.62	3.00	.38	***

Ratings translate as follows: 1.0 = Not True at All; 2.0 = Not Very True; 3.0 = Sort of True; 4.0 = Very True

***Mean difference is statistically significant at the .001 level.

ANALYSIS► Students in groups that engaged in more "quality" service-learning activities reported better outcomes than students in classes with fewer "quality" activities, and the differences in outcomes were statistically significant.