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There is great promise and significant challenges to sustaining and expanding service learning—both as a method of teaching and a method of educational reform. While the practitioners that use service learning are convinced of its benefits to youth, it has been difficult to substantiate claimed outcomes, particularly those related to academic achievement. There are problems in the depth of practice, the depth of research, and the expectations for outcomes.

The purpose of the Summit was to get people together to share, from their own perspectives, their expectations of service learning, its impact, and what they think is needed to make the case for service learning so as to ensure that the field of service learning survives and thrives long into the future.

The Summit brought together thirty-nine people with various perspectives—practitioners, funders, policy makers, researchers—as well as a few experts in communications, marketing and assessment—to review and discuss the impact of service learning and ways to increase our knowledge of impact and improve practice. Participants are listed in Appendix A and the questions we asked participants to consider before they arrived are found in Appendix B.

This summary of the Summit is designed to provide both a sense of what took place and the major themes and areas of “consensus” which emerged from the meeting. We believe it represents one more step, in a long series of steps, that have and will carry this field forward into the future.

The Summit was sponsored by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation through a grant to Search Institute. This grant is one in a series of grants that the Foundation has made in this field and is part of an ongoing effort by the Foundation, led by Chris Kwak, to delineate the next steps needed in making the case for, and telling the story of, service learning.

The Summit was planned by a loose working group that involved, at various points, Dale Blyth, Chris Kwak, Alan Melchior, Paul Berman, Dan Weiler, Katie Heidrich, Jim Kielsmeier, Wokie Weah, Joel Longie, and Search Institute staff members Candyce Kroenke, Beki Saito, and Tom Berkas. The logistics for the Summit were handled by Vicky Mackerman and Candyce Kroenke whose assistance we gratefully acknowledge. The Summit was led by Dale Blyth and co-facilitated by Katie Heidrich.

On behalf of Search Institute, we wish to thank Chris Kwak and the Kellogg Foundation for their support and the participants of the Summit for so generously giving of their time and talents.
The following pages cover the progress of the retreat over the two day period. It describes the events that took place and highlights critical discussions and themes that emerged. We hope it provides a clear view to interesting and important themes emerging during the meeting as well as elaboration on information gathered in group voting.

Saturday

Purpose of the Summit

Thirty-nine people from around the United States gathered in Monticello, Minnesota at the Riverwood Conference Center, September 9th and 10th, 1995, to discuss the impact of service learning and how to improve research and practice to make the case for service learning and ensure that the field thrives and survives.

Chris Kwak, Katie Heidrich, and Dale Blyth made their introductions as Summit hosts and as facilitators. Service learning is at a critical juncture. It has become increasingly popular with new programs and projects created in the last five years. At the same time, it is in danger of losing momentum as its impact on critical outcomes is being questioned. As with all new fields, the expectations for impact on youth, institutions, and the community have often been greater than early impact based on evaluations. There is a need to review these expectations, what is known about impact, and then design a way of coordinating ongoing or anticipated research and evaluation to address critical issues. Research and evaluation have a crucial role to play in “making the case” for service learning and shaping its practice.

While numerous impacts could be examined, the Summit sought to focus on the impact of service learning on middle and high school youth in three critical areas: 1) achievement and learning, 2) citizenship, and 3) psychosocial development. The Summit’s goal was to “delineate ways to both increase knowledge about these impacts and to support and improve practice based on this knowledge.”

As indicated in Table 1, the Summit had three major objectives—1) prioritize impacts and align expectations, 2) facilitate coordination of ongoing or anticipated research, and 3) to discuss how to use this knowledge to “tell the story” so as to improve practice and sustain and expand support.

More specifically, the Summit provided an opportunity for people to get together and share with each other, from their own perspectives, expectations of service learning in three key areas, delineate ways to increase knowledge about these impacts, discuss the dilemmas that hinder both research and practice, and delineate strategies to improve practice and sustain and expand support. The purpose of the Summit, as visually portrayed in Figure A, is to help align expectations of impacts and research documentation of impacts so as to increase our understanding of service learning in such a way that practice may be improved and the resources need to sustain it can be secured. The diagram also reminded all participants that the ultimate reason everyone is gathered together is to increase the positive impact on youth and their communities.
**TABLE 1--SUMMIT GOAL AND OBJECTIVES**

**GOAL**

To review and discuss the impact of service learning on youth in three key areas and delineate ways to both increase knowledge about these impacts and to support and improve practice based on this knowledge.

**SUMMIT OBJECTIVES**

A. Discuss and prioritize expected impacts on youth from various perspectives and begin to align expectations, research on these expectations, and the implementation of programs to ensure expected impacts.

B. Facilitate informal coordination of ongoing and anticipated research and evaluation in this area to maximize its utility to the field and its ability to address key issues.

C. Discuss strategies to use current and emerging knowledge regarding the impact of service learning to both improve practice and sustain and expand support.
Figure A -- Aligning, Expectations, Knowledge and Practice

- Expected Impacts on Youth
  - Research Perspectives
  - Policy Perspectives
  - Practitioner Perspectives
  - Funders Perspectives

- Substantiated Impacts on Youth
  - Research Perspectives
  - Policy Perspectives
  - Practitioner Perspectives
  - Funders Perspectives

- Implementation Dilemmas
  - (e.g., quality, consistency, specificity)

- Research Dilemmas
  - (e.g., measurement, design, access)

- Improving Understanding
  - Improving Practice
  - Improving Resources

- Increase Impact on Youth and Their Communities
Clarifying Claims for Youth--Impacts Expected in Three Key Areas

Activity
The goal of this exercise was to ascertain the claims that are being made for service learning. That is, what does the field of service learning claim to do for youth? The large group broke into four groups with specific perspectives--researchers, practitioners, policy makers and funders--to brainstorm, from their perspectives, the impacts that have been demonstrated or are expected of service learning in the three key areas of intellectual development, psychosocial development and citizenship. The raw lists generated from that exercise are found in Table 2. The table is divided into the categories of intellectual development, psychosocial claims and citizenship. Under each of these headings, expected impacts are listed by perspective (i.e., policy makers, funders, practitioners and researchers).

Summary
Clearly, there are a myriad of expectations that each of the perspectives have for service learning as reflected in the charts. This led to much discussion. Persons who represented the funding perspective were clear that sources require quantitative proof of the benefit of service learning in order to recommend and fund programs particularly in the area of academic achievement in which the outcomes desired are improved grades and test scores. On the other hand, many of the impacts that practitioners listed are qualitative, reflecting the more personal nature of the outcomes of service learning they see on students on a day-to-day basis.
TABLE 2--EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF SERVICE LEARNING FROM FOUR PERSPECTIVES

Intellectual Development

Policy Makers
- Motivated learners - higher education, careers
- Learning by doing “applied learning”
- Employability (Scans) competencies
- Increased retention of content
- Helps understanding of interdisciplinary learning and multidisciplines
- Depth of learning and understanding - another way of knowing
- Life-long learning, learning continuum
- Increasing higher thinking
- Learning thinking skills
- Higher test scores
- Philosophy of education - progressive movement

Funders
- Academic achievement:
  - General academic achievement
  - Specific subject matter
  - Cognitive development - higher order thinking skills, critical thinking/problem solving
- Motivation to learn
- Behavioral outcomes:
  - Decreased absenteeism
  - Increased interest in school
  - Increased engagement
  - Development of future aspirations, independent learning
  - Ability to do structural reflection

Practitioners
- Provides relevance to learning (& engagement)
- Many possibilities - depends on curriculum, writing skills, voice, interview skills
- Interdisciplinary connections: social studies, science, math (combined as one theme)
- Problem solving
- Consciousness of value of knowledge is to improve society
- Decision-making; critical thinking
- Reasoning
- Reforming curriculum; re-evaluating content
- Awareness of career choices
- Engagement-saying what is learned
- Self-directed learner
- Learning how to take concepts and apply
- Making real applications (process) with feedback from real context
- Fosters life long learning
- Exposure to subsequent value of different ways of thinking (i.e. approach to problem solving)
- Impact on instruction/delivery - their response
- Perception of what learning is
- Educational socializer - continuity of society
- A reason for school and learning
- Retention increased?
- Improved basic skills?

**Researchers**
- Academic achievement/knowledge (specialized knowledge, application)
- Different subjects, all subjects, citizenship is...
- School retention, grades
- Relevance and interest/engagement in learning
- Cognitive development - higher order, problem solving
- Bridges real life with academic knowledge
- Knowledge for service
- Skills
- Affective
- Must be integrated--service learning integrates intellectual, psychological, citizenship
- Application - then or much later

**Psychosocial Claims**

**Policy Makers**
- Increased: maturity, responsibility
- Self-esteem
- Efficacy (personal, political)
- Tolerance for diversity, points of view of backgrounds, racial, economic, etc.
- Acceptance
- Trust
- Decreased risk factors
- Increased character
- Positive values
- Increased sense of self control
- Deferred gratification
- Capability of social interaction
- Teamwork
- Increased likelihood to work hard
- Increased motivation for pro-social behavior
- Altruism
- Having a vision for the future (sense of hope)
- Stronger sense of self (student as worker, actor, contributor)
- Increased leadership
- Resiliency (youth development)
- Decreased negative influence of peers - peer pressure
- Increased understanding of global perspectives, broadened worldview, opportunity for exploration

**Funders**
- Life skills (teamwork, knowledge of careers, intergenerational relationships)
- Social growth/development (communication skills)
- Work effectively with others
- Concern for others (community, welfare, racial/ethnic diversity)
- Personal growth (self-esteem)
- Personal responsibility
- Willingness to accept responsibility
- Decreased at-risk behavior
- Leadership development
- Increased self-respect as recognition by peers and community increases
Practitioners
- Locus of control
- Social responsibility
- Interconnectedness of society/relationships--cooperation, tolerance
- Meaningful role needed, valued outcome is self-esteem
- Personal efficacy (internal)
- Self empowerment - I can make a difference (external)
- Relationships/learning how to work with groups, individuals
- Moral reasoning - what's right
- Appreciation of diversity, learning the survival language, learned culture of environment
- Acting on strength of a conviction
- Self-determination
- Positive direction to place energy, power
- Contribute and receive pro-social developed youth as resources
- Decreases negative behavior, gives responsibility for actions, try new roles opportunity --for leadership (variety)
- Identity formation

Researchers
- Self-esteem
- Identity development: goals (career, educational, interpersonal) values, beliefs
- Learning for social interactions, cooperative learning
- Competence, self-efficacy
- Reduction in involvement in risk behaviors
- More caring, empathetic
- Leadership, empowerment
- Tolerance/appreciation of diversity
- Collaborative relationships
- Leadership Skills (e.g. planning, implementation)
- Psychosocial development in terms of personal characteristics, e.g. trust, autonomy, initiative, industry (Erickson)
- Responsibility, maturity
- Intergenerational understanding
- Sense of belonging, connectedness, social support
- Takes a holistic view that all learning is integrated and takes place in interactive contexts

Citizenship

Policy Makers
- Participation in public life
- Stewardship
- Connection and engagement
- Increased ownerships and investment in community
- Decreased risk factors
- Continued investment, participation
- Exposure to models/people/practice way of understanding
- “I am a citizen” (I can have an impact); competency/efficacy

Funders
- Fosters sense of caring (for others...diversity, tolerance of other points of view)
- Importance of helping others
- Increased sense of active social responsibility
- Political efficacy
- New links to the community
- Feeling valued by the community leads to sense of:
  A) confidence
  B) worth
  C) citizenship
  D) social responsibility
- Discovery of what citizenship means to “you”
- Engages the issue: “what do you do as a good “citizen”
- Provides opportunities for actualization
- Responds to one of the Year 2000 principles/agenda for youth

**Practitioners**
- Political and personal efficacy
- Connection to community
- Social responsibility and action
- How society works
- Commitment to common good
- Civil discourse
- How to positively participate in diverse society
- Hope and control over future
- Right to participate
- Sustain community
- Multiple intelligences
- Empathy, compassion
- Gives youth opportunity to step out of peer pressure
- Meaningful relationships with adults

**Researchers**
- Behavior - active citizens
- Intent to volunteer in future
- Intent to become politically active (e.g., vote)
- Knowledge - of community --social (people in it), demographics/ environment
- Knowledge of political process
- Active connections with service issues
- Self attitudes - see themselves more connected (efficacious), believe they can make a difference
- Civic responsibility
Prioritizing Claims for Youth

Activity
While the lists were being presented by each group, facilitators quickly attempted to synthesize and reduce impacts in order to provide a summary of the major common claims that are made for service learning in each area. Those reduced set of categories are found in Tables 3 through 5 and were utilized in the following voting process. Each of the participants were asked to vote for the issues/claims they felt were most important to substantiate in order to make the case for service learning. Participants were given three stickers for each of the three broad impact categories. Three of those votes were specially marked so that people could highlight the three impacts (in any area) they felt were of the utmost priority. Stickers were color coded to reflect perspectives (i.e. blue/funders, green/researchers, yellow/policy and orange/practitioners).

Tables 3-5 provide an overall summary of the information that came from the morning’s exercises. There is a table for each of the three broad impact categories. The first two columns of each table represent areas in which participants felt that the field should either conduct more research or claim less. (These votes are discussed in a later section.) The third column specifies the impact claimed made for service learning. Column four signifies the type of vote, whether a regular vote or a specially marked one. The “%” row indicates the percentage of people with that perspective who endorsed the importance of substantiating a particular claim. Columns five through eight represent each of the four perspectives (research, policy, funding, and practice). The top row of these columns represents the number of regular votes from each perspective endorsing each impact. The second row specifically designates the number of specially marked votes designating a high priority. The Grand Total column gives the total number of votes for that particular outcome and the last column ranks the outcomes order based on that total. The outcomes are listed in order of importance.

These votes on outcomes should be interpreted with some caution. Some members of the group felt that the final outcome categories inadequately summarized earlier discussions. For example, they argued that separating behaviors and attitudes in the area of citizenship made the voting process difficult and less useful. Given limited time, facilitators did not attempt to reach consensus on the lists. It should also be noted that not all voters used all of their votes.

Highlights

Citizenship Claims (see Table 3)
In the area of citizenship, the following three outcomes received the most votes: a sense of responsibility (71% of the total group), a sense of belonging to the larger community (66%), and social/civic/political efficacy (63%). Appreciation of diversity was an outcome rated more highly by funders and practitioners. Although the group as a whole rated political awareness a low priority, a substantial number of researchers (7 of 12) rated this goal as important. In general, there was much consensus in this area as to which outcomes were important to substantiate, However, only 13 of the 70 special votes cast were in this area--19% of these high priority votes.

Psychosocial Claims (see Table 4)
Of the list of psychosocial claims, a majority of the group felt that the impacts most important to substantiate were that service learning augments youths’ attitudes toward social responsibility (77%) and the development of leadership and social skills (54%). Self-esteem and self-efficacy (43%) and moral values (37%) were the next highest vote getters. This area had somewhat less consensus beyond the top two outcome types. Funders rated behavioral outcomes higher while researchers rated a sense of identity or career higher. Only 11 of the 70 specially marked votes were in this domain (16%).
**Intellectual Development Claims (see Table 5)**

Finally, in the area of intellectual development, the group votes indicate that the field has strong expectations for general academic achievement (60%), problem solving and critical thinking skills (57%) and moderate expectations for engagement in learning (49%) and academic performance (43%). There was less consensus across perspectives about what should be claimed by way of impact than in the other two areas. Researchers and practitioners agreed that problem solving and engagement in learning were important. The other perspectives did not have these in their top three. All funders saw general academic achievement as the most important (100%). Most perspectives (except for practitioners) saw performance as important.

Perhaps the most dramatic point to come out of the voting was that 66% of the votes which were marked to designate highest priority were used within the area of intellectual development and over a third of these were in the single category of general academic achievement.

**Overall Prioritization**

Participants placed the majority (66%) of the specially marked votes in the category of intellectual development indicating that while the group felt that there are important expectations for impact in the areas of psychosocial development and citizenship, the overall priority for research was placed on the impact of service learning on intellectual development. Only 19% of marked votes were placed in the category of citizenship and participants placed the least priority on personal and social development with 16% of the specially marked votes.

**Summary**

Of the claims that are expected, a substantial amount of research has shown that service learning can impact psychosocial and citizenship outcomes. On the other hand, research has not demonstrated with any surety that service learning impacts intellectual development and academic achievement. Most people also noted that most practitioners would appear to be implementing service learning for psychosocial and citizenship goals rather than achievement goals. The group sent a strong message that it is key to prove impact on intellectual development and academic achievement, which are more central to the mission of the schools, in order for the field of service learning to survive and thrive in educational settings. Unfortunately, as the group indicated later in the day, it also felt that it may not be possible to do this. Given this possibility, the next wave of service learning research on academic achievement might do well to focus less on proving increased academic performance using grades and test scores as measures and focus more on general achievement, critical thinking and problem solving skills, and engagement in learning which were more fully supported in the vote.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes for More research</th>
<th>Votes for Claiming Less</th>
<th>Specific Outcome</th>
<th>Type of Vote</th>
<th>Votes by Perspective</th>
<th>Total by Type</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>RANK ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sense of Responsibility (e.g., intent to volunteer, be politically active, ownership and investment)</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>6 5 4 4 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>2 1 1 2 6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>67% 86% 83% 60% 71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sense of Belonging to a Larger Community (e.g., new links to community, &quot;I am a citizen&quot;, connection, right to participate, feeling valued by community, discovery of their own citizenship)</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>8 3 3 7 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>75% 43% 50% 80% 66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Social/Civic/Political Efficacy (e.g., power in language, sustain community, make a difference in community, hope/control over future)</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>3 7 3 5 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>2 0 0 2 4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>42% 100% 50% 70% 63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Appreciation for Others/Diversity (e.g., tolerance, appreciation of diversity, sense of caring)</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>4 2 3 5 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>33% 29% 50% 60% 43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social/Civic/Political Awareness (e.g., understanding how society works, knowledge of social demographics, exposure to models)</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>7 1 2 0 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>58% 14% 33% 0% 29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Social/Civic/Political Activity (e.g., decrease anti-civic behavior, acts of citizenship, what do you do as a good citizen, agenda for youth)</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>3 1 0 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>25% 14% 0% 20% 17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TOTAL VOTES</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 20 16 29 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people voting</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 7 6 10 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of total votes cast</td>
<td></td>
<td>36% 20% 16% 29% 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: * The % row shows the percentage of people with that type of perspective who voted for that impact.
** 13 of the votes marked (X'ed) as most important were in this domain -- 19% of 70 special votes cast.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes for</th>
<th>Votes for</th>
<th>Specific Outcome</th>
<th>Type of Vote</th>
<th>Votes by Perspective</th>
<th>Total by Type</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Research</td>
<td>Claiming Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psychological - efficacy, esteem, hope</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Moral - what's &quot;right&quot;, values</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sense of Identity - career, &quot;who I am&quot;</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Behavioral - reduced risk; peer pressure</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Maturity - deferred gratification (NOTE: people commented on lack of clear meaning here)</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL/INTERPERSONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attitudinal - social responsibility, interconnectedness, altruism, sense of belonging</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Skills - leadership, communication, team work, general social skills</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Diversity/Broaden Horizons - empathy, compassion, Intergenerational, global</td>
<td>REG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>TOTAL VOTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people voting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of Votes Cast by Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:  * The % row shows the percentage of people with that type of perspective who voted for that impact.
** 11 of the votes marked (X'ed) as most important were in this domain -- 16% of 70 special votes cast.
### TABLE 5 - VOTES REGARDING IMPACTS ON INTELLECTUAL DEV. **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes for</th>
<th>Votes for</th>
<th>Specific Outcomes</th>
<th>Type of Vote</th>
<th>Votes by Perspective</th>
<th>Total by Type</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>RANK ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Research</td>
<td>Claiming Less</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>General Academic Achievement (reading literacy, numeric literacy)</td>
<td>REG3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Problem Solving/Critical Thinking</td>
<td>REG3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Engagement in Learning (behavior)</td>
<td>REG3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Performance (Grades, overall)</td>
<td>REG3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motivation to Learn (attitude)</td>
<td>REG3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Specific Life Skills (employability)</td>
<td>REG3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Expanded set of learning styles and their application (learn by doing, self-directed)</td>
<td>REG3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Specific Academic Achievement - course content (environmental science)</td>
<td>REG3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X'ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>TOTAL VOTES</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people voting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of total votes cast</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
* The % row shows the percentage of people with that type of perspective who voted for that impact.

** 46 of the votes marked (X'ed) as most important were in this domain -- 66% of 70 special votes cast.
Research Underway

Activity
Five researchers with major impact studies underway or just beginning, briefly described the research projects that they are conducting. These include the Learn and Serve America K-12 National Evaluation, the CalServe Evaluation (California's Learn and Serve America Programs), a Search Institute research study of the Impact of Exemplary Middle School Service Learning Programs on Achievement, Active Citizenship Today (ACT), and research on the Effects of Participation in the Helper Model of Service Learning in Early Adolescence. Summaries of those projects are found in Appendix C.

Highlights
Alan Melchior gave an overview of the Learn and Serve America evaluation project which is designed to look at the impacts of service learning on students, schools and community. Thus far, they have tested for impacts in many areas and are redesigning the next step in the evaluation to focus on schools meeting minimum criteria.

Paul Berman provided a description of the CalServe evaluation project, a project designed to evaluate California’s Learn and Serve America programs. He indicated that this research was working to ensure that the outcomes of service learning programs are not averaged. There is great discrepancy in the depth and quality of service learning programs and that low intensity service learning programs bring limited results. In this case, it makes sense to look at exemplary programs and then determine impact. Timing of the research is difficult given their pre- and post-design and it is difficult finding programs that are fully implementing quality service learning.

Tom Berkas provided an overview of the research that Search Institute is just beginning; the project is geared to look at the impact of service learning on academic achievement and learning in three exemplary middle school programs. It is designed to see if there is impact in this domain when high quality programs that focus on these goals are examined.

Larry Bailis briefly described the ACT research project; its goal is to look at the impact of specific social studies service learning projects on citizenship.

Debbie Hecht described research that has been proposed on the Peer Helper Model. The research, geared towards urban middle schools, is focused on a number of specific variables such as adult support, type of projects, reflection qualities and student input into activities. She hopes to determine the impact of service learning and these variables on a number of outcomes such as attendance, test scores, responsibility and problem solving. This project was recently funded.

Summary
Given the discussion over the course of the first part of the Summit, the research that is being conducted generally appears to be on the right track. The research described is focused on issues important to the group including academic achievement, exemplary practices, avoiding averaging across low and high quality programs, and differentiated research looking at the impacts that follow specifically from different types of service learning programs. Consideration is also being given to proving impact on academic achievement indirectly through outcomes such as improved school attendance. However, it was noted that in the future that researchers should work more closely with practitioners to devise research questions.

Alan Waterman diverged from the discussion that took place after the presentation of research projects underway to make a critical point, although not necessarily representative of the group’s opinion. He made a very strong recommendation to measure the impacts of service learning using the individual as the unit of measure because there are so many potential impacts of service learning on people and that
those impacts will vary depending on the individual. In short, while many individuals may experience impact if they do so in very different ways, even within a given program, it will be lost when averaging across youth to assess one impact type.

**Priority vs. What We Can Actually Prove**

**Activity**

At this time, Summit participants revisited the day’s discussion to lend a sense of closure to the morning’s events. The facilitators noticed a certain sense of frustration among participants. While the different perspectives had brainstormed and then prioritized the claims that are made for service learning, there was a lingering dissatisfaction that a key dilemma had not been resolved. While certain outcomes must be proven to help the effort survive, we may not be able to meet all of the expectations that are made of service learning—particularly in showing that service learning augments general academic achievement and, more specifically, grades and test scores.

To put closure on the morning’s events and address this dilemma, the facilitators asked participants to place three green (go) stickers on the categories in which they felt we should do more research to prove that service learning works in this area as claimed. Participants were also asked to place three red (stop) stickers on those outcomes where they felt we should stop making claims about impact.

**Highlights**

The results of the voting are presented in the first two columns of Tables 3-5. While it was clear that the original intent of the exercise was to make the categories represented by the red and green stickers mutually exclusive, several people wanted to place both their red and green stickers in this category signifying that while we don’t think we can prove impact and maybe we should stop making claims in this area, we still need to do more research. People were permitted to place red and green stickers on the same outcome.

**Citizenship Claims**

Specifically in the area of citizenship, the greatest endorsement for more research came in the category of social/civic/political efficacy with nine votes. No one felt the field should do less research in this area. An increased sense of belonging received five votes. The bulk of the group felt, on the other hand, that we should stop making claims in the area of social/civic/political activity. In other words, we should not try to claim that service learning increases the social/civic/political activity of youth either in the short or long run but that it does create a sense of self-efficacy in these areas. Part of this vote reflects concern over promoting activities that might be seen as lobbying.

**Psychosocial Claims**

Within this area, the greatest endorsement for more research came in the behavioral category, that is, research demonstrating effects of reduced risk and negative peer pressure. It should be noted that this impact was not of the highest priority even within the category of psychosocial claims. The most noticeable outcome to stop making claims for was for the category of increased maturity/deferred gratification with fifteen red votes. This particular outcome should be interpreted with some caution as many Summit participants felt that the meaning of this category was unclear. Claims about moral development received ten stop votes.

**Intellectual Development Claims**

When Summit participants were asked to indicate the areas in which we need more research and the areas in which we are claiming too much, an interesting paradox emerged in the intellectual development domain. The greatest endorsement for more research was in the area of general academic achievement (20 votes); however, even more endorsed the idea of claiming less in this category (21 votes) with some placing a sticker in both categories. Again, discussion reflected the group’s strong
need for demonstrating this outcome though many of the participants felt that it is unlikely that, given current programs, researchers will be able to show a conclusive link. A second outcome where more research is needed (17 votes) is in the area of Problem Solving/Critical Thinking. No one felt that the field should claim less in this area which may signify a promising direction for new research. Eleven people did suggest reducing claims for impact on general performance.

**Summary**
Overall, academic achievement was the highlighted topic in the discussion. Again, the group was unsure as to whether researchers will in fact be able to prove links between service learning and general academic achievement given current programs. Consequently, there were concerns that we may be over-selling and claiming too much for the field of service learning particularly in the areas of academic achievement and performance. Terri Sullivan, however, best summarized one resolution to this dilemma—we can either work on the paradigm that asserts service learning impacts academic achievement and try to meet those goals and demonstrate these impacts or we can find out what service learning can do and communicate more about the importance of these outcomes to key stakeholders. While there was a lot of positive feedback from the group in response to this recommendation, the response, particularly from the funders, was that service learning will survive to the extent that service learning can deliver what schools are accountable for—academic learning, grades and test scores.

Similar concerns, that too many claims are being made, were also expressed in the areas of citizenship and psychosocial outcomes, but the greatest concerns were expressed for impacts with lower priority and where poor wording of options may have affected the votes.

**Dilemmas for Research on Service Learning**

**Activity**
The group broke down into small groups by perspective once again and discussed the dilemmas of service learning research, program implementation, and marketing the overall field of service learning paying special attention to the case of academic achievement. The group also discussed recommendations designed to overcome the barriers to successful service learning. A list of what each group generated is found in Table 6.

**Highlights**
The most common themes that emerged from the dilemmas discussion include:
- Service learning may be overselling itself and making too many claims.
- There are no common widely accepted and used definitions for service learning.
- Research does not match the reality of current service learning implementation. Additionally, research does too much averaging across youth and programs.
- Policy and school administrations do not fully buy into it as a method for educational reform.
- Service learning is just one of many reform methods.

The most common themes that emerged from the recommendations include:
- Alliances are needed.
- We need to look at academic achievement as more than just test scores.
- Differentiated research is needed.
- We need to look at the possibility of indirect impacts on academic achievement through intervening processes.
- There is a need to focus on fertile ground for service learning and increase support for teachers.
TABLE 6--FACTORS AFFECTING SERVICE LEARNING

Practitioners
- The practice of service learning is shallow.
- Don't know where to take service learning next.
- It is difficult to do service learning well. More thoughtful practice is needed. So far, practice has been fragmented.
- As service learning gets to be deeper, it is very hard to make it mainstream practice.
- There is initial enthusiasm for service learning and then interest wanes.
- There is strong emphasis on environment and multiculturalism in service learning around the country.
- It is important to identify best practices in connecting service learning to the community and to outcomes for youth.
- Need to show gains and benefits to students.
- Case studies are a concrete way of showing impacts vs. the percent approach.
- We need both qualitative and quantitative. We need quantitative so that we can convince policymakers to move service learning into the schools.
- Most do service learning for psychosocial or citizenship goals, not for academic achievement.
- Frustration that administration does not understand service learning.
- Need data on different kinds of outcomes.
- We're using inexpensive fixes now—it takes commitment from the school and community.
- A need for differentiated research.
- The nature of service learning is qualitative. You have to reflect this. Perhaps use case studies embedded in numbers as a marketing tool for teachers and community.
- Faced with choices as practitioners to choose projects in order to achieve certain outcomes.
- Caring and nurturing ultimately affects academic achievement.

Funders
- The need to fund studies of how different designs affect different outcomes
- Intended goals and activities/clarify relationship
- Correlation between depth and sustainability or whether or not school has achieved a critical mass; the higher the level you go in school districts and government, the likelihood of stronger demands on academic achievement.
- Need for more research and theory on academic achievement and tie together what is already known.

Researchers
- Issues raised regarding different stages of development
- Design vs. implementation issues
- Practitioners see results—how to prove to others
- Interest in exemplary practices and identifying those
- Research on issues related to what practitioners are seeing vs. researcher choices
- Proof and results wanted
- Training technical assistance—not enough training available
- Many do not know about service learning utilization
- What it takes to get a teacher started
- Movement from doing something to doing it well
- Getting into the community level
- Most literature is already anecdotal—lots of case studies; need to organize it at this point or put it in a form that people can grasp
Policy Makers
- Documentation--need qualitative and quantitative information to prove; so far only qualitative
- Input does not equal expected outcome
- Funders and policymakers have not demanded quantitative results; they need to demand it more
- Need for standards in training and practice

Assessment Experts
- Address concerns of American public--school violence, discipline, dropouts, attendance, graduation. Service learning should keep track of these indicators. These have impact on achievement in the long run.
Reflections on Day One

Activity
At the end of the day on Saturday, two staff members from Search Institute and the team of assessment experts provided their thoughts as to the progression of the day's discussion and suggested resolutions to some of the dilemmas of the group.

Highlights
In order to provide a framework for the Summit and the purpose for this event, Beki Saito provided an historical summary leading up to the Summit and recounted events over the past twenty years. First, she described the grassroots service learning efforts designed to promote outcomes of citizenship, student involvement and psychosocial outcomes. At that time, there was little research documenting the benefits of service learning and little or no attention from policy makers or funders. Later in the picture came Conrad and Hedin and other researchers who made the first established efforts to show quantifiable effects of service learning on students. However, over time, the research emphasis changed and the majority of research done to date has been more qualitative. Interest in service learning grew and schools and teachers in larger numbers started to adopt service learning as a method for educational reform. However, more recently, interest has grown in the need for accountability. Schools and practitioners are being asked to demonstrate not just the qualitative impacts of service learning but to be able to "scientifically" substantiate quantifiable outcomes, particularly academic outcomes. The service learning field has gotten to the point in which it has become necessary to clarify definitions and goals for service learning. It has also become necessary to formulate research plans to meet the needs for accountability which brings us to the purpose of the Summit.

Tom Berkas described the events that need to occur to devise those best practices that meet the accountabilities described by Saito. He argued that we are at the point where we need to identify standards for schools to meet (academic) accountabilities. The field could develop service learning curriculums based on these standards and implement programs in the classrooms based on those standards. Then, it is important to analyze the effectiveness of these programs in the classrooms. If a particular best practice is effective, teachers work to improve and update their practice and continue to use these strategies. If the field cannot confirm the benefit of a given practice, the field needs to identify alternative standards that are put through the same cycle of implementation and testing until the field has a fully established list of exemplary standards.

One of the researchers expressed reservations with this model indicating that it oversimplifies the problem. The dilemma researchers face is not that they do not have a model for establishing best practices but that the problem is devising research projects that accurately measure the reality of service learning outcomes given the diversity of practice.

Ed Roeber raised the issue of top down (researcher) assessment vs. bottom up (teacher) evaluation procedures. He suggested that it would be a good idea to bring concepts of validity and reliability to practitioners so that practitioners and evaluators can share in program assessments. This may serve to improve the quality of research questions and the programs.

Sharif Shakrani reflected on his concern about the type of assessment that is done in the United States and felt that it is necessary to look at multiple outcomes, not just academic achievement or any other be all, end all variable.

Lauren Resnick suggested that researchers should use alternate methods of assessment and develop standards for measuring service learning outcomes that have teeth, such that you can really measure and detect outcomes. This is what will be necessary in order to change policy. She felt that the content standards that have been used to date have been too inadequate to yield results.
Sunday

Strategies for Improving Practice--The Fishbowl Event

Event
Service learning practitioners were positioned in a circle in the middle of the room and asked to talk about the field of service learning from their perspectives while the rest of the group listened. The group found the ‘fishbowl’ exercise to be very enlightening and that the practitioners’ perspective will be helpful in research and advocacy. After this discussion, each of the perspectives provided a list of their own observations, needs and suggestions for the field of service learning.

Highlights
Some of the common themes that emerged from the groups is that:

- There is a lack of understanding and appreciation for service learning at some levels. It is not a high priority and it is difficult to sustain interest. There is not enough deep practice.
- There is a need for differentiated research that links certain types of programs to certain outcomes
- There is a need for both qualitative and quantitative research. It will be necessary to do more quantitative research in order to impress policy makers and funders. In particular, it is important to show academic achievement outcomes--especially as the number of service learning programs reach a critical mass.
- It is important to identify exemplary practices.

Communication Perspective--Telling the Story of Service Learning

Event
Tom Reis provided his perspective about the state of the field of service learning. His thoughts are included with those of the Reflections Panel beginning on page 28. Terri Sullivan then presented a classic approach to marketing as it applied to service learning.

Highlights
Both Tom and Terri felt it necessary for the group to come together and focus on a common definition of, and goals for, service learning. They both indicated that it can be detrimental to the movement to market it before the group has clear consensus about the issue.

Nancy Murphy, from the Corporation, argued that it is not possible to wait for standards and definitions. For many, it is critical that people keep marketing service learning even if there is no consensus otherwise people will lose funding.

Barbara Gomez, from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), indicated her dissatisfaction with the discussion. She noted that the Alliance had already had this discussion and had, in fact devised common definitions for service learning and that the participants at the Summit were reinventing the wheel.

In the discussion that ensued, it was observed that while definitions had been devised by the Alliance, there had been little follow up after that conference. Most of the group were unaware of these definitions. As a result, there were still no commonly understood definitions of service learning. The
focus of the Summit shifted from devising a marketing plan and definitions to devising action steps needed to help the field “thrive and survive”.

Summary
One of the problems in sustaining the field of service learning may be that there has been many entrepreneurial, “Lone Ranger” types who have taken service learning and shaped it into what they have needed with strong grassroots activities. This is good because it signifies that service learning is a flexible educational alternative. However, it also means that people are not grouping their efforts, maintaining standards and following definitions. Furthermore, few mainstream, well-established, national educational organizations have been seriously involved to date. Given where the service learning field is at this point, in order for it to survive, the leadership will have to coalesce and people will have to get behind a clarified set of goals or exemplary standards or the movement will not continue to advance and service learning will never be a serious tool for educational reform. Given that the ultimate goal of the Summit is to ensure the survival of service learning, it will be important that people get together and agree to some uniformity and to some commonalities so that the energy that is being put towards service learning is focused rather than scattered and so that service learning is done keeping clear, high quality standards in mind.

Next Steps Needed for the Field to Survive and Thrive

**Event**
Each of the perspectives (researchers, funders, policy makers, and practitioners) devised a list of action steps they believe need to be taken using succinct language to develop clear end goals. The group as a whole discussed these and refined the list. Each person was then asked to vote for the three action statements s/he felt were the most critical next steps for action and to weight the importance of those steps from one to five, five signifying the greatest importance and one the lowest. The facilitators then tallied and summed the weighted votes. The results are found in Table 6.

The different perspectives groups developed 18 strategies for next steps. The first column indicates which perspective nominated the strategy. The second column lists the strategy. The column labeled “Votes by Weight” lists the number of votes a particular strategy received as broken down by weight or importance. A weight of one signifies low importance and a weight of five signifies high importance. Each weight was multiplied by the number of votes and then these numbers were summed. Rank order of strategies was based on this weighted sum (in the Sum (Average) column), not on the percentage of votes received. “Average” signifies the mean score of the weights of all the votes in a row. “% voting” represents the percentage of total participants voting for a particular strategy regardless of weight.

**Highlights**
The group felt that the most critical next step and the only strategy to receive a majority of votes is to fund research and evaluation studies to measure the effects of various models of service learning programs (63%). Because this might be seen as self-serving if the votes all come from researchers, Dale Blyth asked for a share of hands on who voted for this strategy. Those voting for this strategy included people from all perspectives and most were by non-researchers. The strategy was nominated by funders. The next three strategies each had more than 40% of the group voting for them. They were to develop a common vision, strategic plan, and definitions (40%); clarify student outcomes relative to various service learning practices (43%); and to create multiple ways to connect researchers and practitioners clearinghouse for assessment and evaluation tools (46%--a strategy suggested by practitioners). The next two important strategies were to organize for advocacy at the local, state and national levels (29%) and to assure commitment at all levels to comprehensive, sustained training and technical assistance, best practices and standards (29%).
Strategies involving public awareness, dissemination of what is already known, focusing on school boards and superintendents, developing a national membership organization, and coalescing the leadership of the field were rated of medium priority. Finally, strategies placing more emphasis on federal definition, establishing quality standards, integration with broader reform efforts, and locating alternative funding sources were least popular among those voting.

Summary
Clearly, the group felt that more research needs to be done in order to make the case for service learning. That research needs to be differentiated, i.e., the desired outcomes need to match the program type. It also needs to involve researchers consulting with practitioners in order to devise the best research questions and evaluation approaches. Finally, when we make claims, we need to make claims appropriate to the programs. Key issues discussed at the Summit also included getting behind the same set of goals and standards, having a common vision for the field of service learning and finding a way to focus energy and efforts rather than allowing them to remain divergent. These are all strategies that involve leadership. Finally, the next set of strategies mostly involve communicating the results of the earlier strategies—or telling the story to key people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy was nominated by</th>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>Votes by Weight</th>
<th>Sum (Average)</th>
<th>RANK ORDER (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDERS</strong></td>
<td>Fund Research &amp; Evaluation Studies to measure the effects of various models of Service Learning Programs.</td>
<td>7 2 3 4 6 66</td>
<td>3.0 (63%)</td>
<td>1 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP GENERATED</strong></td>
<td>Develop a common vision, strategic plan, and definitions</td>
<td>0 2 3 5 4 53</td>
<td>3.8 (40%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY PEOPLE</strong></td>
<td>Clarify student outcomes relative to various Service Learning practices.</td>
<td>1 3 5 4 2 48</td>
<td>3.2 (43%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRACTITIONERS</strong></td>
<td>Create multiple ways to connect researchers and practitioners (e.g., clearinghouse for assessment and evaluation tools).</td>
<td>3 4 4 2 3 46</td>
<td>2.9 (46%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCHERS</strong></td>
<td>Organize for advocacy at both the local and state national levels.</td>
<td>0 2 2 3 3 37</td>
<td>3.7 (29%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRACTITIONERS</strong></td>
<td>Assure commitment at all levels to a comprehensive sustained training and technical assistance, best practices and standards.</td>
<td>2 1 2 1 4 34</td>
<td>3.4 (29%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDERS</strong></td>
<td>Concentrate support on fertile ground--schools, districts and school reform networks with the potential to bring Service Learning to scale.</td>
<td>4 1 4 1 1 27</td>
<td>2.5 (31%)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRACTITIONERS</strong></td>
<td>Develop systematic/ongoing Public Awareness campaign includes intra &amp; outer audiences.</td>
<td>2 3 0 1 3 27</td>
<td>3.0 (26%)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDERS</strong></td>
<td>Focus attention on local school boards and superintendents using documentation that includes stories/personal experience as well as outcome data.</td>
<td>0 4 3 2 0 25</td>
<td>2.8 (26%)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP GENERATED</strong></td>
<td>Coalesce the leadership in the field.</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 4 25</td>
<td>4.2 (17%)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7 -- PRIORITIZED ACTION STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy was nominated by</th>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>Votes by Weight</th>
<th>Sum (Average)</th>
<th>RANK ORDER (%) voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLICY PEOPLE</td>
<td>Target funding on in-depth practice school sites to develop successful demonstration models and connects to them</td>
<td>3 3 1 3 0</td>
<td>24 (2.4)</td>
<td>11 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCHERS</td>
<td>Pull together and disseminate what we know.</td>
<td>3 2 3 1 0</td>
<td>20 (2.2)</td>
<td>13 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP GENERATED</td>
<td>Develop a national membership organization.</td>
<td>1 2 2 1 1</td>
<td>20 (2.9)</td>
<td>13 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY PEOPLE</td>
<td>Develop Standards for Training.</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td>20 (3.3)</td>
<td>13 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACTITIONERS</td>
<td>Integrate Service Learning into the discussion at alternative assessment and educational reform.</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 1</td>
<td>19 (3.2)</td>
<td>15 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCHERS</td>
<td>Establish standards and mechanisms to recognize and support quality.</td>
<td>3 3 1 0 0</td>
<td>12 (1.7)</td>
<td>16 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP GENERATED</td>
<td>Alternative funding sources.</td>
<td>2 1 0 1 0</td>
<td>8 (2.0)</td>
<td>17 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDERS</td>
<td>Begin to focus implementation of Service Learning program by tying funding more closely to the federal definition of Service Learning.</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>18 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF PEOPLE VOTING**

| 35 | 35 | 35 | 33 | 34 |

**NOTES:** Although votes were not done by perspective, a question was raised about whether this was simply researchers voting for more funding -- A show of hands indicated this was not the case as most votes came from non-researchers.
Prior to the Summit’s start, a group of people from the different perspectives were asked to reflect on what they heard and provided their perspectives regarding the Service Learning Summit and the state of the field of service learning. The panelists were Tom Reis (Communications), Lauren Resnick (Assessment), Lance Potter (Funding), Ricardo Millett (Evaluation), Frances Parker (Practice), and Jim Kielsmeier (Intermediary Organizations). Those reflections are summarized below.

The reflections panel represented a variety of different perspectives in the field ranging in expertise from communications and marketing to policy and government and funding to school administration and practice. A number of issues in the field of service learning as well as potential solutions to the obstacles and dilemmas faced in the service learning field were raised; the panel offered a number of suggestions to the service learning field in order to enable it to survive and thrive.

Tom Reis--Communications, W.K. Kellogg Foundation
Tom Reis raised the concept of social movements and described the juncture at which a movement either dissipates or refocuses its goals around a few core areas. He linked this to service learning which has been described as a movement at a critical juncture in its development. A movement starts based on a real need and a real idea; a movement grows with an assortment of agendas and its survival depends in part upon prioritizing certain elements (elements that are relevant, marketable, impactful and sustainable) from those agendas. It is important to focus our energies in the same direction and support the same set of goals.

He was impressed with the passion and excitement of the group around the issue of service learning and felt that this is one of the group’s greatest strengths for promoting this topic. He added that service learning is relevant and timely, there are positive outcomes that can be demonstrated from service learning, and there is a lot of knowledge and information about it. However, the biggest challenge the group faces is coming to consensus about the definition of service learning, what we agree it can accomplish and clarification about what it means to sustain and expand support for it. We must do this before we can seek to market it as a mainstream educational methodology or we could harm the movement. Once ready, he suggested designing the marketing process backwards, from a traditional and classic audience approach. We need to think about who it is we’re trying to convince and what they need from us in order to be convinced of the worth of service learning.

Lauren Resnick--Assessment, Learning Development Corporation
Lauren Resnick came as an outsider to service learning and originally felt that the group had conflicting service learning goals and definitions—that for some, service learning is pedagogy, a method of teaching by which students learn academic lessons, and for others, service learning is an end in itself, a good thing to do, an activity that entails student service that helps to weave the social fabric of the community. By the end of the day on Sunday, she had changed her mind and concluded that service learning entails both types of issues; service learning is fundamentally a moral objective, a social vision promoting connectedness over alienation, but it also promotes school learning and it is designed to expand social and interpersonal problem solving skills and general academic skills (though the latter may be a secondary goal).

She felt that in order to keep service learning alive, it is important to create alliances with other groups that could also promote the service learning agenda such as the youth development and religious communities. Given that academic achievement will be hard to prove, it would also be useful to ally with those trying to change the definition of academic achievement (from standardized test scores). Given that service learning has a two part definition, it also has two areas of accountability, but this
can be used to a strategic advantage. One of the key things the public wants is safe schools and discipline in the schools; service learning could perhaps do very well by focusing on these social issues in order to thrive.

**Lance Potter--Funding, Corporation for National and Community Service**

The influx of federal dollars has had a profound impact on the field of service learning and also on the impressions of the federal government, that service learning can, in fact, be used to augment academic achievement. Other service learning outcomes have also been profound but the focus of the federal government is on solving problems and many of the (moral) outcomes that we find important and interesting are not important to federal government leaders; they are focused on academic achievement. So another possibility for strengthening the link between service learning and academic achievement is through an indirect approach, through proving the link between service learning and academic achievement by showing ties between service learning and other variables that impact upon academic achievement such as school attendance.

**Ricardo Millett--Evaluation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation**

In his first comments, Ricardo Millett opened by saying he felt that this was either the best planned and executed seminar or the most focused and enthusiastic group of diverse people committed to a single issue that he had ever worked with. Secondly, he remarked at the tension among researchers who feel the conflicting demands of advocating for service learning and doing objective research. The resolution at the Summit for practitioners and researchers was for practitioners to inform researchers about what impacts they see in the classrooms and what expectations are realistic and to prioritize issues so that we know where to focus the evaluation and research enterprise rather than force the researchers into the awkward position of advocacy.

There is general agreement that it is important to link service learning to academic achievement. Unfortunately, past research has been weakest in this area. Possible reasons for this include overreaching ourselves in claims that are being made for service learning; the lack of field-wide consensus on the emerging definition of service learning or theory defining its relationship to academic performance; the great variability in program design features, implementation strategies, and school or district level of support for service learning; or the lack of adequate training materials for teachers and allied personnel for knowing how best to achieve desired service learning outcomes in specific community, organizational, and student contexts.

He made nine recommendations in order to overcome those obstacles: 1) avoid overstating program outcomes; 2) develop “learning theory” that links service learning to academic achievement related variables such as motivation to learn, school retention, graduation rates, reduction of negative student behaviors, etc. and determine how these elements relate to academic achievement; 3) build consensus on definitions with a willingness to be flexible to an emerging definition with other components offered by other key stakeholders; 4) encourage current evaluation/research activity to help the field identify best service learning practices; 5) determine which types of service learning programs operating in which types of communities and institutional contexts tend to work with what kinds of students to affect what kinds of outcomes; 6) rather than starting from ground zero, build on what we already know; 7) use the student as the unit of analysis vs. using narrow constructs such as “cognitive development”; 8) create ways to involve “students” and “teachers” to improve/inform/create service learning models; and finally, 9) conduct high quality training in best practices. In the final analysis, our challenge is one of documentation of the impacts of service learning and to market those outcomes. We are now challenged as funders to support the outcomes of this Summit.
Frances Parker--Practice, Dewey Center for Urban Education
Given the focus on recommendations to researchers and funders particularly concerned with academic and affective motivations to service learning, Frances Parker offered input specifically to educators and administrators about the relationship between the schools and the communities. She felt that service learning is an important way by which you can get the communities and schools to work together and thus foster the communities' desire to support the schools. This is important for the educational system in the long run and for educational reform activities like service learning. Given the tremendous number of aging baby boomers that vote, it is important and critical to gain the financial support of this group and to increase their feeling of civic responsibility towards the schools. It is also key for educators and administrators to market service learning, to present at conferences and expose as many people in the schools to service learning in the interim while we wait for research results.

Jim Kielsmeier--Intermediary Organizations, National Youth Leadership Council
Jim Kielsmeier felt that we do a great job with evaluation and research and that it is important not to give up on looking at the relationship between service learning and academic achievement. He concurred that safety and discipline are important issues but that we need to keep a focus on academics. Research is not just outcome based; it also has a formative impact on practice and if we don’t look at the potential of academic achievement now and make every attempt to demonstrate it early on, service learning will not have the potential to evolve into an academic based teaching methodology. While it is true that young people don’t all learn the same way, all children from every culture can learn important lessons through service learning. By persisting in our efforts, Jim felt we can pull together something uniquely American. He offered three suggestions. First, it is important to keep the quality of service learning high. If we do good work, service learning will work and it will be here tomorrow. Secondly, service learning is at a critical period with regard to federal, state and private funding; it is important to gird for the worst case scenario and be able to provide mutual support for each other. Finally, it is important to be patient, to stay within one’s means regarding resources of time and money. Don’t expect to accomplish everything overnight or to do everything all at once. Take it one step at a time.
In reviewing the results of our active and engaging two days with leaders from various perspectives, I am struck by four points we worked through and seven themes we need to hold up and utilize as we move forward. Four key points emerged:

I. Differential Importance of the Impact on Intellectual Development

- Intellectual development received 66% of the votes for what impact was most important. Within this area general academic achievement, critical thinking/problem solving, engagement in learning, and performance were most often selected as important.

- Impact on citizenship was less important (18% of votes) and most important within this domain was sense of responsibility, belonging, and civic efficacy.

- Impact on personal & social development was least important (16% of votes) and most important within this domain was a sense of social responsibility/connectedness, social skill development (leadership, team work), self-efficacy and value development.

II. Concerns over Claiming Too Much

- Several concerns were raised about over-selling or claiming more than can be delivered given current implementation.

- These concerns were particularly true in the area of general academic achievement and performance (32 people noted one or the other concern).

- Similar concerns in citizenship and youth development areas were less likely to be about the most important outcomes and were more likely associated with poor wording of options (e.g., deferred gratification and increased political activity).

III. Suggestions on Where Research is Needed

- Summit participants noted that the strongest need for research on impact is in the area of intellectual development--specifically general academic achievement and problem solving/critical thinking--two important impact areas.

- Only two other areas got even 9 votes--impact on sense of social/civic/political efficacy and impact on reducing negative behaviors -- and these were not seen as the most important impacts in these areas.

IV. Strategies for Thriving and Surviving

- The number one strategy--advanced by funders and endorsed by 63% of those present (not just or even primarily researchers)--was to fund research and evaluation studies on the effects of various models of service learning. Similarly, clarifying outcomes from various service learning programs was the third most endorsed strategy.

- The second strategy, and one which the general flow of the second day reinforced, was the need to develop a common vision, strategic plan, and core definitions (an option generated by the group as a whole and endorsed by 40% of those voting).
The fourth strategy involved creating multiple linkages between researchers and practitioners especially around tools for assessing impact (an option suggested by practitioners and endorsed by 46% of those voting).

The fifth strategy has to do with increased advocacy at local, state and national levels (an option suggested by researchers and endorsed by 29% of those voting).

The sixth strategy had to do with commitments to training and technical assistance surrounding best practices (with endorsement from about 29% of those voting).

Strategies involving public awareness, dissemination of what is already known, focusing on school boards and superintendents, developing a national membership organization, and coalescing the leadership of the field were rated in the middle and essentially represent a communications strategy.

Strategies placing more emphasis on Federal definition, establishing quality standards, integration with broader reform efforts, and locating alternative funding sources were least popular among those voting.

In addition to these areas of apparent consensus (at various levels), we need to be mindful of the following overarching images or themes:

**Commitment** --

There is a very committed and enthusiastic group working in this area and they can make an even bigger difference than they already are.

**Contradictions** --

There are a number of contradictions in definitions and goals that must be addressed before a clearer, sharper vision can emerge and move the field forward.

**Consensus Building**--

While there is an emerging consensus on many broad issues, there is less real consensus than is needed to move forward in a focused effective way.

**Cooperation** --

The field is marked by surface level cooperation and also a lack of trust and established leadership with a track record of being able to follow up effectively. There is less real collaboration of a fundamental nature and this inhibits progress.

**Conceptual Clarity** --

The field is suffering from a lack of conceptual clarity/rigor about both key dimensions of implementation and impact as well as the theoretical and empirical connections between these domains. The sudden availability, and potential disappearance, of Federal funding has contributed to this problem as it spawned increased programming before clarity or infrastructure was fully in place.
**Connections --**

The field remains too disconnected from other education efforts and needs to build strategic alliances to advance its cause as a movement once the direction is set.

**Choices --**

Fundamentally, the field is faced with choices it must now make about what it seeks to be, to whom, and with what impact. These choices affect practitioners, policy makers, funders and researchers. Failure to choose can result in failure to advance.

All of these themes and many of the strategies can be thought of as issues of leadership (who chooses, who resolves contradictions, who builds consensus and cooperation to harness the commitment that exists), or research (how do we get conceptual clarity and assess alternative choices). Finally, as we have leaders who help align and clarify expectations and research that can “make the case” for service learning, we will need to communicate with the key people in effective ways to tell the story in ways that strengthen practice and impact youth.
Approximately 40 people who have various perspectives on service learning or particular expertise we thought would be useful in meeting our objectives were asked to participate in the Service Learning Summit on the 9th and 10th of September, 1995. This group was comprised of people with research and evaluation perspectives; funding perspectives; practitioner perspectives; and policy perspectives. Some people had more than one perspective on the field. In addition, we invited individuals with expertise in communication and marketing as well as the current state of educational assessment. A summary of who attended follows.
SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS, BIOGRAPHIES AND CONTACT INFORMATION

LAURENCE BAILIS

Larry Bailis is a researcher at the Center for Human Resources at Brandeis University. He has directed evaluations of Learn and Serve programs in higher education and of other service learning programs.

70 Leicester Road
Belmont, MA 02178
(617) 489-2487
Fax: (617) 489-2484
or
Center for Human Resources
Brandeis University
60 Turner Street
Waltham, MA 02154

THOMAS BERKAS

Tom Berkas is an Evaluation Associate with Search Institute where he is presently conducting external evaluations of several national service learning programs including the National Service Learning Initiative II and the Peer Consultant Initiative, both funded by the Kellogg Foundation.

Search Institute
700 South Third Street, Suite 210
Minneapolis, MN 55415
(612) 376-8955
Fax: (612) 376-8956

PAUL BERMAN

Paul Berman is the President of RPP International and has focused a great deal of his work on education policy evaluation, school reform and restructuring. He led a two-and-a-half year evaluation of California’s School Improvement Program, a $215 million statewide effort to reform the ways in which schools throughout California plan and implement their instructional programs. He has directed four widely acclaimed action plans for educational reform and restructuring—in Minnesota, California, Hawaii, and Idaho and recently led projects that developed a detailed agenda for change for California’s community colleges and a plan for strengthening California’s education and training system. He currently directs an evaluation of California’s service learning programs.

RPP International
819 Bancroft Way
Berkeley, CA 94710
(501) 843-8574
Fax: (501) 843-2436
DALE BLYTH

Dale Blyth is the Director of Research and Evaluation at Search Institute and has directed the evaluation of several service learning programs. His past research has focused on the social and psychological impacts of the transition into adolescence in different school contexts and expanding our knowledge of the social worlds of adolescents and how parents, relatives, other adults, and peers are important in youths' lives in terms of both prosocial and antisocial behaviors. He serves as host and facilitator for this Service Learning Summit.

Search Institute
700 South Third Street
Suite 210
Minneapolis, MN 55415
(612) 376-8955
Fax: (612) 376-8956

WADE BRYNELSON

Wade Brynelson is the Assistant Superintendent for Interagency Children and Youth Services for the California Department of Education. He is responsible for the policy and management of the CalServe Program, California's K-12 Learn and Serve program. He also represents the State Superintendent of Public Instructions on the California Commission on Improving Life through Service and has been a founding member of Youth Service California and the Alliance for Service Learning and Educational Reform.

CA Dept. of Education
CCPMD, Second Floor
Sacramento, CA 94244-2720
(916) 657-3115
Fax: (916) 657-4969

IRVING BUCHEN

Irving Buchen is a researcher at Walden University. In 1991, he was part of the Pennserve evaluation team under Carl Fertman. After that collaboration, he joined forces with Fertman to write a service learning curriculum which has been adopted by a number of school districts and departments of education across the country. Presently, he serves as an advisor to the Social Science Service Learning Consortium at the University of Colorado in Boulder and to the Oklahoma Department of Education Alternative Academy Service Learning Program. He is also co-writing two books, one a service learning Directory, the other a Delphi study on the Future of Service Learning.

Irving Buchen
Walden University
801 Anchor Rode Drive
Naples, FL 33940
(800) 444-6795
Fax: (813) 261-7695
MIKE BUSCEMI

Michael Buscemi is the Vice President of Quest International where he serves as the Project Director of the Kellogg Service Learning project. He is a founding member of the Alliance for Service Learning in Education Reform, an advisory committee member to Points of Light “Family Matters” and member of NASSP Blue Ribbon Panel on teen service awards.

Quest International
537 Jones Road
P.O. Box 566
Granville, Ohio 43023-0566
(614) 522-6400
Fax: (614) 587-3699

CARL FERTMAN

Carl Fertman is a researcher at the University of Pittsburgh. He directs the evaluation of the Pennsylvania K-12 Service Learning programs supported by Learn and Serve grants and has authored two books on service learning.

University of Pittsburgh
5D21 Forbes Quad
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
(412) 648-7191 or -7196
Fax: (412) 648-7198

ANDREW FISHER

Andy Fisher is the Program Officer at the DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund and is responsible for three grantmaking areas including career exploration and preparation, reform of vocational education and service learning. The Fund’s grants in service learning have totalled nearly $9 million.

Program Officer
DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund
23rd Floor, 2 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016
(212) 251-9720

BARBARA GOMEZ

Barbara Gomez directs the Council of Chief State School Officers’ Service Learning advocacy and technical assistance initiatives. She works primarily with state education agencies promoting greater awareness and understanding about service learning as a strategy for school improvement. She also designs and implements a wide variety of service learning technical
assistance services for states including conducting national and regional conferences and publishing service learning and related materials. She served for two years as coordinator for the Alliance for Service Learning in Education Reform, a national service learning coalition comprising service learning practitioners and advocates committed to integrating service learning into educational reform. Current CCSSO funded service learning initiatives include a project to identify, examine and document school/school district models that link or integrate service learning and school-to-work/career development activities; the Peer Consultant Initiative, aimed at providing support services to a total of 24 state education agencies involved; and ongoing technical assistance to states on creating a service learning and student assessment consortia.

CCSSO
One Massachusetts Ave. NW, Ste. 700
Washington, D.C. 20001-1431
(202) 336-7026
Fax: (202) 808-8072

DEBORAH HECHT

Deborah Hecht is a Project Director at the Center for Advanced Study in Education (CASE), City University of New York Graduate Center. She is an Educational Psychologist, specializing in psycho-educational research, assessment and evaluation, measurement design, and multivariate statistics. For the past three years, she has worked with the National Helpers Network on a small scale study of service learning in order to develop research objectives and assessment tools for a larger study of the impact of the Helper Program upon young adolescents.

Center for Advanced Study in Education
CUNY Graduate Center
25 West 43rd Street, Room 620
New York, NY 10036
(212) 642-2986
Fax: (212) 719-2488

KATHERYN W. HEIDRICH

Katie Heidrich is the President of CenterPoint Management, Inc., a consulting firm providing guidance to decision-makers in the public and nonprofit sectors. Her work in helping organizations solve problems has included leading strategic planning conferences, conducting marketing research, facilitating planning and problem solving meetings, and directing management studies. A consultant to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation in the Philanthropy and Volunteerism programming area, she recently completed a strategic issues survey of service learning leaders.

President, Centerpoint
114 Church Street
New Lenox, IL 60451
(815) 485-3230
(800) 747-3232
Fax: (815) 485-0886
Jim Kielsmeier is the CEO of the National Youth Leadership Council and works in the areas of training, materials and curriculum development and public policy related to service learning. He brings personal experience as a teacher, outward bound instructor, soldier, forest service crew member and university teacher/administrator where he practiced and has thought about service and learning.

National Youth Leadership Council  
1910 West County Road B  
Roseville, MN  55113  
(612) 631-3672  
Fax: (612) 631-2955

Carol Kinsley is affiliated with the Community Service Learning Center which provides training and technical assistance to service learning practitioners through institutes and conferences. She directs the New England partnership in the National Service Learning Cooperative/Clearinghouse's Peer Consultant Initiative and sponsors a regional conference annually.

Community Service Learning Center  
333 Bridge Street  
Springfield, MA  01103  
(413) 734-6857  
Fax: (413) 747-5368

Candyce Kroenke is a research assistant at Search Institute and assists in the evaluation of several service learning programs including Generator Schools, the National Service Learning Initiative II and the Peer Consultant Initiative. She is the Project Coordinator of this Service Learning Summit.

Search Institute  
700 South Third Street  
Suite 210  
Minneapolis, MN  55415  
(612) 376-8955  
Fax: (612) 376-8956
CHRIS KWAK

Chris Kwak is a Program Director in Philanthropy and Volunteerism at the Kellogg Foundation where she helps create and review Foundation programming priorities, evaluates and recommends proposals for funding, and administers projects. Previously, she directed national programs for the National Youth Leadership Council where she managed a national service learning initiative, fundraising, staff, and training. She is host to this Service Learning Summit.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation
One Michigan Avenue East
Battle Creek, MI 49017-4058
(616) 969-2334
Fax: (616) 969-2693

ROBERT LONG

Bob Long is a Program Director in Philanthropy and Volunteerism at the Kellogg Foundation. He has worked with community based youth development organizations for over 20 years, where service has been used as a teaching tool and developmental method long before service learning emerged as an approach to teaching and learning.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation
One Michigan Avenue East
Battle Creek, MI 49017-4058
(616) 969-2680
Fax: (616) 969-2693

JOEL LONGIE

Joel Longie is the Director of National Technical Assistance for the National Service Learning Cooperative. He also directs the Peer Consultant Initiative in the Midwest and oversees the national implementation.

National Youth Leadership Council
1910 West County Road B
Roseville, MN 55113
(612) 631-3672
Fax: (612) 631-2955

VICKY MACKERMAN

Vicky Mackerman is an Administrative Assistant at Search Institute and has been the Logistics Coordinator for this Service Learning Summit.

Search Institute
700 South Third Street
Suite 210
Minneapolis, MN 55415
(612) 376-8955
Fax: (612) 376-8956
Kate McPherson is the Director of Project Service Leadership, a program that provides state leadership for integrating service learning into the curricular and co-curricular school programs. In her position, she provides technical assistance to hundreds of schools, colleges, and businesses, helping them to design and organizationally root service learning programs. As a classroom teacher and program coordinator, she has designed programs which involved thousands of private and public students in service to their community. She also directs the Peer Consultant Initiative in the Northwest.

Project Service Leadership
12703 NW 20th Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98685
(360) 576-5070
Fax: (360) 576-5068

Alan Melchior is the Deputy Director and a Senior Research Associate at the Center for Human Resources at Brandeis University. He is the study leader for the evaluation of the Serve-America program now being completed by Abt Associates and Brandeis University for the Corporation on National Service. He is the Project Director for the new Corporation-sponsored national evaluation of Learn and Serve America K-12. He is also the Co-Director of an evaluation of the ACT Program (Active Citizenship Today) operated by the Close-Up and Constitutional Rights Foundations and funded by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Foundation.

Brandeis Univ. Ctr. for Human Resources
60 Turner Street
Waltham, MA 02154
(617) 736-3775
Fax: (617) 736-3773

Ricardo Millett is the Director of Evaluation at the Kellogg Foundation where he monitors the development and implementation of evaluation strategies for Foundation programming. His efforts focus on improving projects through greater communication, team building, and using evaluation as an integral part of programming.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation
One Michigan Avenue East
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Fax: (612) 627-3204
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The Summit focused on the impact of service learning programs for middle school and high school youth in three areas -- achievement/learning, citizenship, and psychosocial development. Before the Summit, participants were asked to consider the following questions:

1. What impact does service learning claim to have in each of these three areas and how realistic are these claims? What are the critical variables/dimensions in each of the three areas where the impact of service learning is most likely to be experienced by most youth in “quality” programs? Where is the field claiming “too much” and raising unrealistic expectations?

   Impact on Achievement/Learning

   Impact on Citizenship

   Impact on Psychosocial Development

2. How might we more carefully define what we mean by impact in each of these three areas in a way that allows a useful linking of theory, new assessments, and practice and permits a fuller examination of impact that can begin to systematically make the case for the benefits of service learning? What are some of the barriers we face in more fully aligning these factors?

3. What strategies might be useful to better communicate current and future research findings in a way that most improves practice and systematically builds the case for service learning to key audiences such as funders, policy makers, community members, and school districts?
The following pages describe five studies in various stages that were identified as holding potential for making major contributions to our knowledge of youth impact. To the extent possible, we invited the people involved with these projects in one or more ways to be participants in the Summit. These researchers were invited to share their research, project results and the progress they had made to date. These studies were, by no means, the only ones being conducted at the time. However, they represented a group of researchers who had been in contact and in which opportunities for informal coordination were optimal. Studies that were completed or that were in their later years were not included.
Learn And Serve America K-12
National Evaluation Overview

The Corporation for National and Community Service has provided approximately $30 million in funding for school-based community service learning programs in 1994-95. The Learn and Serve K-12 evaluation is designed to assess the impact of these programs in three major areas:

- the **impact on program participants** -- in terms of involvement in the community and community service, increased educational attainment, and improved life skills and reduced risk behaviors;

- the **institutional impact** of CNCS-funded community service programs on participating schools and community agencies -- in terms of the development of permanent service learning programs, the expanded use of service learning; the integration of service in school curriculum, and/or changes in policies and procedures at schools and community agencies to encourage and support community service efforts; and

- the **community impacts** of school-based service learning programs on the beneficiaries of service and the community as a whole -- in terms of the specific accomplishments of service programs and the impact on the broader community in terms of increased voluntarism or collaboration among schools and community agencies.

To address these issues, the evaluation will examine the development and operation of CNCS-funded community service programs in 20 local sites around the country, representing a mix of elementary, middle, and high school-based programs. Major elements of the evaluation will include:

- A **participant impact study** of program participants beginning with the 1995-96 school year. The participant impact study will include pre- and post-program surveys of service learning participants and a comparison group of non-participating students; 6 month post-program follow-up surveys; analysis of school record data; and focus group interviews with program participants.

- Evaluation of **institutional impacts** through on-site interviews with program coordinators, school administrators, faculty, students, and host agency representatives, and through school-wide surveys of students and faculty in participating schools.

- Evaluation of **community impacts** through on-site interviews and surveys of program administrators, students, host agency representatives, service beneficiaries, and school faculty and administrators. A major element of the community impact study will be a regular telephone survey of host agency administrators in all 20 program sites to collect information on program accomplishments, service quality, and the value of the services provided.

The Learn and Serve K-12 evaluation is being conducted by the Center for Human Resources at Brandeis University and Abt Associates, Inc. The Center for Human Resources is a nationally recognized research, training, and policy development center working in the fields of youth employment and education. The Project Director for the evaluation is Alan Melchior, Deputy Director and Senior Research Associate at the Center.

For further information, contact: Alan Melchior, Center for Human Resources, Brandeis University, 60 Turner Street, Waltham, MA 02154. Phone: (617) 736-3770, FAX: (617) 736-3773.
RPP International has contracted with the California Department of Education’s CalServe Office to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the state’s Learn & Serve America programs. Throughout California, CalServe partnerships implement service learning in a wide range of schools (elementary, secondary, alternative and restructuring), settings (rural, urban, suburban), and structures (multiple schools in one district, entire schools, an entire grade level at a single school, one class at a single school), using a variety of methods (cross-discipline integration, core curricular integration, individual versus group service activities, etc.).

To answer overarching issues of how effective these K-12 service learning programs are and how effective strategies can be more widely used and spread, the RPP evaluation will address three primary research questions:

1. How are service learning programs being implemented?

2. What are the impacts, over time, of service learning on students, teachers, schools and school reform, institutions other than schools, and communities?

3. What programmatic, contextual and implementation factors and strategies are associated with effective practices? (One such factor is the effect of AmeriCorps in projects that cover both activities.)

In addition to addressing these key evaluation questions, RPP intends to examine the relationship between service learning and school reform efforts.

The evaluation is designed in two phases:

**Phase I Evaluability Study** (May-September 1995): Gather data on all CalServe partnerships and select a sample of sites (10-12 partnerships) for intensive evaluation in Phase II. Sampling criteria include: grade level, maturity, quality, program structure, AmeriCorps involvement, school size, urbanicity, and student demographics.

**Phase II Process and Outcome Evaluation** (October 1995 - September 1997): Using a quasi-experimental design, measure student, teacher, school, and community impacts and program implementation at a sample of sites. Tentative data collection plans include: student achievement tests (developed by Northwest Evaluation Association; pre- and post-administrations to cohorts of students in service learning classes and, in 1996-97, students in comparison group); pre- and post-student and teacher surveys (adapted from Search Institute); student portfolios and journals; student focus groups; school record data; classroom observation, and interviews with coordinators, teachers and community partners. Major student outcome variables are student achievement, engagement in learning, self-esteem, social responsibility, communication skills, problem-solving skills, sense of civic responsibility, capacity for teamwork, appreciation of diversity, and efficacy/ internal locus of control.

For more information, contact: Paul Berman, RPP International, 819 Bancroft Way, Berkeley, CA 94710. Phone: (510) 843-8574, Ext. 113, FAX: (510) 843-2436
Research Study Of The Impact Of Exemplary Service Learning Programs On Achievement

This research study is part of a larger, newly funded Kellogg grant to NYLC entitled the “National Service Learning Leadership Initiative.” The study is just one part of the overall grant. The overall project is designed to augment and solidify the intellectual foundations upon which service learning is built.

The research project is designed to locate and then examine the impact of three exemplary middle school service learning programs that intentionally focus on cognitive changes in achievement and learning. Unlike most other research described, this is not intended to be an evaluation of a particular program but rather a study of the impact of three different exemplary service learning programs which explicitly focus their service learning programs to impact on learning objectives.

Summary of primary research questions:

• What is the impact of service learning on the cognitive development (both academic and intellectual achievement) of 6th to 8th graders in three exemplary middle school service learning programs which emphasize intellectual outcomes?
• What are the mechanisms through which the impact occurs (e.g. increased engagement in learning)?

Types of service learning programs involved:

Exemplary middle school programs, grades 6 to 8, selected based on expert nominations and a review process.

Basic design/methodology:

A simple longitudinal study of all youth in grades 6 through 8 and those in a comparison group to assess impact over time in multiple areas. We will utilize multiple tools to measure academic performance, problem-solving competence, and engagement in learning, as well as psycho-social variables. Measurement approaches may include but are not limited to:

• standard and specialized staff assessments of their own students’ progress
• standardized tests of specific abilities in reading, writing, and numerical literacy
• observation and review of students’ performance by other teachers familiar with quality service learning and the relevant aspects of achievement and performance under investigation
• surveys completed by students and staff
• examination of school records from previous years.

For further information contact either Dale Blyth or Tom Berkas at Search Institute (612) 376-8955 or Fax 612-376-8956.
Active Citizenship Today (ACT) is a school-based service learning program that combines civic education with hands-on projects involving local communities. Designed to be integrated into social studies curricula, ACT builds on a five-part framework centered on community problem-solving and community action. Begun in 1992, ACT is operated by the Close-up Foundation and Constitutional Rights Foundation, with principal funding from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund.

In 1995, ACT contracted with the Center for Human Resources at Brandeis University to conduct an evaluation of ACT in three sites (Jackson, Mississippi; Jefferson County, CO; and Omaha, NE) and to assess a new, more intensive implementation strategy focused on a master teacher, team approach. The evaluation has three major goals:

- to assess the **impact of the ACT program on program participants** in terms of such outcomes as civic and community-related knowledge and skills, attitudes towards civic participation, involvement in civic and community service activities, and school engagement and success, including academic and problem-solving skills related to the five-part ACT framework;
- to assess **institutional impacts of ACT** on participating teachers, schools and school districts - in terms of ACT’s integration into social studies and other course curricula, and the extent to which ACT has an impact on instruction; and
- to examine the **implementation of ACT** across the three school districts. Specifically, the evaluation is designed to examine the experiences of teachers and students participating in the ACT model; the ways in which schools and teachers are utilizing ACT; and the variations in implementation across sites. This information will be important in order to put the impact analysis in context and to help strengthen the processes by which ACT can be effectively introduced and adopted by school systems. The evaluation is also examining the implementation and effectiveness of ACT’s new implementation strategy.

To accomplish these goals, Brandeis University’s Center for Human Resources will work collaboratively with CRF/CUF and the three participating school districts to implement the following major evaluation elements:

- **A participant impact study** of program participants. The impact study will be piloted in Spring 1996 for full implementation in Fall 1996. The participant impact study will include: 1) pre- and post-program surveys of ACT participants from schools participating in the intensive training in targeted districts, a comparison group of non-participating students, and a smaller comparison group of students from sites using ACT but not involved in the advanced training; 2) additional, authentic/performance-based assessment strategies that can be used to document the kinds of critical thinking/problem-solving skills at the heart of ACT (to be piloted Spring, 1996); 3) analysis of school record data; 4) six month post-program follow-up surveys; and 5) on-site participant interviews and program observation.

- Evaluation of **institutional impacts** through on-site interviews with program coordinators, administrators, ACT team members, other school staff and students, as well as through observations of on-site training of local ACT teams, the activities of the ACT teams within the schools, and the use of the ACT framework by teachers in the classroom. In addition, the on-site observations and interviews will be supplemented by brief surveys of participating teachers at the
beginning and end of each school year to gather information on the impact of the new ACT implementation approach.

- An implementation (process) study beginning Fall 1995 to examine how ACT has been implemented in the 3 target districts. Information on the implementation of ACT will be gathered through a combination of interviews, observations, and focus groups during scheduled site visits and through a program-wide ACT management information system.

The ACT evaluation is being conducted by the Center for Human Resources at Brandeis University. The Center for Human Resources is a nationally recognized research, training, and policy development center working in the fields of youth education, employment and development. Principal investigators for the study are Alan Melchior and Larry Bailis. Lisa LaCava is the project coordinator.

For further information, contact The Center for Human Resources, Brandeis University, 60 Turner Street, Waltham, MA 02254. Phone: (617) 736-3770, FAX: (617) 736-3773.
The Service Learning Impact Study is a multi-faceted, three-year research project to examine the impact of the Helper Model. This research will explore whether and how participation by middle school students in the Helper Model of service learning contributes to academic or school-related skills, enhances psychosocial abilities, and leads to the acquisition of skills for the school to work transition.

The goals of this project are:

- to examine the impact of participating in the Helper Model of service learning in early adolescence
- to identify how impact is related to program characteristics and the types of service students perform

**Sample:** Exemplary Helper Programs have been selected for the project (approximately 1000 students). Although programs differ in how the Helper Model has been implemented, they all share the essential features of a Helper Program, such as reflection. Comparison data will be obtained from students not involved in service learning.

**Methodology and Data Analyses:** Data will be collected from service learning and comparison students, teachers, program leaders and school administrators, using surveys, interviews and observations. Student data will be collected pre and post. The data analyses will rely upon a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. The impact of service learning on students and differences in impact according to program characteristics will be investigated by comparing student responses over time, contrasting service learning students with comparison students, and examining differences across sites and programs.

**Consultation Groups:** The project has two consultation groups: An Advisory Board consisting of experts in the areas of education, early adolescence, evaluation and applied educational research; A Research Planning and Liaison Group including teachers and program representatives from each participating program; and a Student Advisory Group including students representatives from each participating school.

**Dissemination:** Research reports will be disseminated through the Network, CASE, researcher and practitioner journals, and presented at professional meetings and conferences.

For more information, contact: Deborah Hecht, Center for Advanced Study in Education, 25 West 43rd Street, Room 620, New York, NY 10036. Phone: (212) 642-2986, FAX: (212) 719-2488
EVALUATION OF THE SUMMIT

At the end of the two day retreat, participants were asked to evaluate the degree to which the Summit was able to successfully meet the objectives set in Table 1. The questions posed to Summit participants are found below. The evaluation summary follows on the next page.

1.1 Do you feel that the participants of this Summit included all of those who should have been present?

1.2 If not, who should also have been invited?

2.1 During this Summit do you feel that there were sufficient discussions between those from different perspectives? Please explain.

2.2 Do you feel that those present at this Summit were able to move forward to create a common agenda? Please explain.

3.1 To what extent did the Summit accomplish its stated objectives (see p. 4 of Service Learning Summit Briefing Book)?

3.2 Where did it fall short?

4.1 In what ways might the Summit change what you do in the future?

4.2 Do you feel that this Summit has provided you with the tools to increase the effectiveness of your evaluation of service learning efforts? Please explain.

5. What major issues or concerns were not adequately addressed at the Summit?

6. To what extent do you think this Summit will help align research and expectations to better get the knowledge we need to substantiate the case for service learning’s impact on youth?

7. What three recommendations would you make at this point about the next steps to improve the practice, support for, and general understanding of service learning?

8. If there was one product or paper to come out of this Summit, what should be its focus or title?
SERVICE LEARNING SUMMIT EVALUATION SUMMARY

Service learning Summit participants were given an evaluation survey to complete at the end of the two-day retreat. Twenty-seven participants responded to the evaluation of a total of thirty-three participants that were non-staff and non-hosts. Those that responded were generally satisfied with the conference. People were generally satisfied with the composition of the group and were pleased with the unique opportunity to share information with researchers, practitioners, policy makers, funders and other experts from a variety of organizations and different perspectives. Participants felt that a great deal was accomplished given the limited amount of time allowed in the ambitious Summit agenda. Many noted that as a result of the conference, they will be better able to connect to others in the field of service learning and that their interests and ideas for new service learning research have been clarified. The conference was considered an excellent beginning to solidifying an agenda for the service learning movement and it inspired people to continue to join together to further the field of service learning. People clearly had a great deal of energy and passion about service learning, about educational outcomes for youth and about the future of service learning.

Fifty percent of participants felt that the Summit mostly included or included all of those who should have been invited. Approximately twenty-five percent didn’t have strong feelings or any feedback about the group composition, and twenty-five percent felt that distinct perspectives were missing. Missing perspectives which were noted included: practitioners with a greater spectrum of approaches or more representative of classroom teachers (20%); youth with experience in service learning/ a student voice (20%); state and local education leaders (e.g., state and district superintendents)(20%); and community members and organizations (20%).

The vast majority felt that there were sufficient and adequate discussions between persons representing different perspectives (75%); some were particularly pleased with the opportunities during free time to network and communiate with others (15%). Fifteen percent of the group felt that while there may not have been adequate discussions between perspectives, the time for this opportunity was maximized. Only two of twenty-seven people indicated that there were simply not enough opportunities for discussion. Many would have liked more in-depth discussions and a few felt that the large and the small groups were simply too large to allow thorough discussions of the perspectives and get beyond first opinions.

Fifty percent of the respondents felt that Summit participants were not “able to move forward to create a common agenda” for service learning at the two day retreat. Several participants added that people’s egos blocked successful collaboration. Thirty-five percent felt that an agenda either had been created or that it had been created as well as it could be in the time available. Fifteen percent were unsure as to whether this goal had been accomplished.

Participants felt that the biggest obstacle to accomplishing the objectives established for the Summit in the briefing book was time (60%). The goals and objectives set forth were very ambitious for a two-day retreat and the planners overreached given the size of the group and the time allotted. Other reasons that Summit participants provided as to why the Summit objectives were not met included missing topics for discussion (discussions of best practice, policy, advocacy leadership), a discussion of the future coordination of activities and follow-up, confusion about directions, and a lack of respect for participants. Fifteen percent felt specifically that two of the Summit objectives that had been listed in the briefing book, A, discuss and prioritize expected impacts on youth from various perspectives and begin to align expectations, research on these expectations, and the implementation of programs to ensure expected impacts and C, discuss strategies to use current and emerging knowledge regarding
the impact of service learning to both improve practice and sustain and expand support, had been accomplished but that the other objective, B, facilitate informal coordination of ongoing and anticipated research and evaluation in this area to maximize its utility to the field and its ability to address key issues, had not. Another fifteen percent felt they would have liked to have spent more time on either A or C but did not specifically mention B. Ten percent felt that the objectives were fully accomplished.

The great majority indicated that the Summit would change what they do in the future regarding their work in service learning. Thirty-three percent have better links to others in the service learning field, particularly with other researchers although one person felt that the Summit improved links between practitioners and researchers. They reported that they will be better able to network, that they will be more sensitive to possible networking connections and that they will purposely connect with these people to coordinate and plan future evaluation activities. Another thirty-three percent felt that discussions at the Summit helped to focus and clarify research interests and goals and the methodologies with which they will conduct research. Despite the calls for action from the reflection panel to make every attempt to measure the link between service learning and academic achievement, only one person specifically mentioned a commitment to focus on measuring academic achievement in her/his research. Ten percent specifically noted they will continue to advocate for service learning. Another ten percent left the question blank or indicated that they are unclear as to next steps. Fifteen percent reported an increased awareness, knowledge and understanding of service learning related issues.

Regarding the question in the survey about whether the Summit has provided participants with tools to increase the effectiveness of the evaluation of service learning efforts, the response was split four ways even though the added feedback was all very similar. Twenty percent of respondents left this question blank; given that this question is addressed more specifically to people directly involved in research and evaluation, this is not surprising. Ten percent felt that the summit provided new evaluation tools to a small degree or did so indirectly. Thirty-three percent felt that yes, the Summit conference provided them with the tools to increase the effectiveness of their evaluation efforts and another 33% felt that no, the Summit conference did not provide them with tools to do this. The feedback that was added to yes and no answers, however, was not substantially different. For those that felt they had not acquired actual evaluation tools, many of them felt that they had acquired new ideas, choices, directions and different approaches to evaluation. For those that answered yes, most responded in the same way, that their route to tools is indirect, that they acquired new ideas, choices and approaches to evaluation.

Despite the fact that people wished for greater depth in discussions, fifty percent of the participants felt that all Summit issues were addressed. Issues that respondents felt weren’t addressed were varied and did not draw strong attention to any particular issue that wasn’t covered but should have been.

Summit respondents felt almost unanimously that the Summit made a positive impact on helping to align research and expectations to better get the knowledge needed to substantiate the case for service learning’s impact on youth. The enthusiasm behind that positive impact varied from “some gains—not as much as I expected” (10%) to “a great extent” and “a considerable degree” (35%). A substantial number of people felt that the Summit provided a great beginning discussion of the problem but that there needs to be a considerable amount of follow-up in communication, further discussion of solutions and clarity of expectations and implementation in order to realize the potential for aligning research and expectations (33%). A few people reiterated the benefits of increased connections (between researchers and practitioners) and increased awareness in supporting this goal.

People offered a multitude of recommendations for next steps that should be made in order to improve the practice, support for and general understanding of service learning. These are listed in Table 1. Table 2 captures the many suggestions people gave as to the titles and subjects for the paper(s) that come out of the Service Learning Summit. Overall, the Summit represents a good start down a much longer road. Mapping out the territory that road should cross is the next major task.
TABLE 1

Responses to Question 7. What three recommendations would you make at this point about the next steps to improve the practice, support for, and general understanding of service learning?

- Programs and people--an annotated bibliography; develop directories of state and local service learning folks; develop ongoing network--state with LEA teams, meeting and working together often to share information and ideas.
- Advocacy
- Continue dialog among participants from ALL areas, publish minutes from Summit, do follow-up survey of participants.
- Educate regarding changes in funding and its implications; strategically plan responses; just do it, i.e. increased quality through practice.
- There are good research projects to be designed--find some way to maintain discussion in research group; there is lots known now--fund a "what works" review for policy makers and practitioners--get it on paper now.
- A national membership organization is essential.
- Organize states, school districts, service learning practitioners about need to form a collaborative to focus on issues of curriculum, instruction and assessment; compile and document existing quality service learning and outcomes; develop standard training.
- Tell the story as we know it right now; conduct whatever studies are necessary to make the case that we currently suspect to be true but can’t yet document.
- Additional discussions on collaboration and communication planning
- Follow-up meeting and discussion around this priority topic, perhaps to include broader participation; coordinate research efforts in a systematic fashion; invest in existing networks that have demonstrated promising practice.
- Fund research and evaluation studies to measure the effects of various models of service learning programs; organize for advocacy at the local, state and national levels (-national organization -common vision -coalesce leadership); pull together and disseminate what we know.
- Get researchers working together and sharing; get funders to support development of pedagogy; this type of group needs to meet on a regular basis.
- Development of an ongoing communication between group involved in service learning/community service; development of a practitioner-researcher network
- Concentrate support on fertile ground schools, districts and school reform networks; fund research and evaluation on major alternative service learning model; connect researchers and practitioners and school administrators.
- Fully support the Summit group recommendations.
- Continue to inform researchers, policy makers about what’s happening in service learning; develop clear plan for getting the service learning word out; develop an ongoing connection between practice and research.
- Create a mechanism for connecting practitioners and research; create mechanisms for advocacy; do more to identify best practices--promote quality.
- Clarify outcomes, document and disseminate.
- Share with the field the recommendations generated by the Summit; follow up on the recommendations (implement); work closer with funding agencies and seek their input.
• Take the weighted lists from this Summit into a small group and more focused examination to develop a document which will help guide through a form of validation, the building of “the case”; share it widely; track the work on the elements of “case” forever!

• Hold a similar meeting on the standards of training and developing standards of training--best practices; more people need to know what it is--in a nonthreatening, nonconfrontational manner.

• Hold more convergent conferences like this; publish and disseminate results; focus on future of service learning (especially since some feel it has one).

• Agreement on what we mean by service learning--building on existing work--understanding the many ways service learning is done; plan, fund and conduct research to show potential; convene group for funders, education allies as part of marketing package.
**TABLE 2**

Responses to Question 8. If there was one product or paper to come out of this summit, what should be its focus or title?

- The Role of Research in Improving Practice, Support for, and Understanding of Service Learning
- Funding--Implications of Decreased Federal/State funding and Alternatives; Practice and Research--Increased Quality Through Collaborative Research
- There is lots known now--fund a "what works" review for policy makers and practitioners-get it on paper now.
- Service Learning Conversations: Practitioners, Policy Makers, Evaluators, and Funders Talk; I would hope an article with this title might appear in the Phi Delta Kappan
- Informing and Improving Practice of Service Learning
- Discussion summary with next steps
- Service Learning Summit: Reestablishing the National Agenda
- Research and Evaluation Dilemmas in the Service Learning Field; also strong need to create a document that synthesized research efforts
- Why one? The data from the voting activities on both days would be very useful and of interest to those here and not here; I could conceive of a vision piece reporting the spirit and outcomes and ideas. This could be published in multiple places--CRF, YSA, NYLC.
- Copies of all the notes from each item of the agenda; some reflection statements about cooperation and sharing for group members--at some point we need to coalesce for the good of the group; results of the survey
- Aligning the goals and activities of service learning practitioners and evaluators; Also, it would be useful to have a summary report on conference distributed to participants.
- Advocacy for Service Learning
- The Strategies for Moving Service Learning to the Next Level
- Establishing an Agenda for Action to Advance Service Learning
- Clarify outcomes, document and disseminate.
- Recommendations from the last session
- Building a common vision that will guide all service learning activities
- Toward building consensus on the theory/practice of service learning and its effects on youth in school settings
- The effects of integrated service learning tracking methods--a list of the primary targeted and intentional effects/impacts of use of service learning in teaching across a curriculum
- Identification of key issues, concerns, recommendations--and dissemination of this product widely--asking for feedback and input
- Next steps
- Service Learning: A Wholistic Approach to Educating Youth
Errata

Two of the participants at the Summit are not listed in the appendix. Donna Power represented the Closeup Foundation at the Summit with a funding perspective. Laura Lee Geraghty also attended part of the Summit and is Director of the Healthy Communities Initiative at Search Institute. The number of Summit participants thus totalled forty. Contact information is included below. We apologize for the errors and for any inconvenience caused.

DONNA POWER

Closeup Foundation
44 Canal Center Plaza
Alexandria, VA
22314
Phone: (703) 706-3640
Fax: (703) 706-0000

LAURA LEE GERAGHTY

Search Institute
700 South Third Street, Suite 210
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone: (612) 376-8955
Fax: (612) 376-8956