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INTRODUCTION

The 1999-2000 Guidelines for CalServe Evaluation Reports are based on the local evaluation process that was initiated in the winter of 1998. The general purpose of the guidelines is to assist each partnership in the writing of its evaluation report. The overarching questions and the content of this year's guidelines are much the same as last year's, as are the mechanisms by which each partnership can submit its report. The purpose of the changes made during the past two years is to make it easier for partnerships to submit information about the outcomes of service-learning for students, teachers, school/school districts, and the community.

Changes to the Guidelines

The most fundamental alteration last year to the guidelines was the introduction of "Report Forms." Because many CalServe partnerships indicated that they spent much of their nominal evaluation budget on consulting fees to pay someone to write a substantial narrative report, the Report Forms were intended to make more efficient use of evaluation funds by eliminating the need to submit a "final evaluation report." With Report Forms, partnerships can spend their time (and evaluation budget) on facilitating the local evaluation team's analysis and discussion of the results in order that the best decisions for program improvement can be made.

For 1999-2000 CalServe evaluation reports, partnerships may choose either to use these report forms or may use a more traditional narrative style of reporting outcomes of their partnership's efforts. However, all partnerships are asked to complete the Partnership Description Report Form so that an overall landscape of service-learning projects in California may be constructed. This one report form is due (either in disk or hard copy form) to the Service-Learning Research and Development Center at UC Berkeley by June 30, 2000.

Partnerships may submit the remainder of their evaluation reports to CalServe either on disk or in hard copy form by September 30, 2000. (Please note that since the bulk of the reports from non-intensive partnerships are due in September, they will not be included in the statewide profile; thus, submission over the Internet to SLRDC will not be an option.) Partnerships wishing to complete the Report Forms for their reports may either download the templates from the Internet site to their own computers or request a Mac or PC floppy disk containing the report form templates from SLRDC.

Partnerships should note that for the 1999-2000 evaluation, some of the report forms have been simplified or reorganized because of insights gained from the 1997-98 statewide analysis or because of changes made by the CDE to information at the ED-DATA website.

Purpose of the Evaluation Process

This evaluation process is intended to be of most value to each local partnership. Evaluation is an essential component of every quality program. The highest and ultimate goal of this process is to ensure that partnerships gather relevant data which will enable them to assess the quality and value of their service-learning activities and to make informed decisions leading to program improvement. Systematic collection and analysis of outcome data will place partnerships in a stronger position to advance service-learning in their districts and communities.
Overarching Questions

The information to be provided on the report forms or in each partnership's narrative report should focus on supplying answers to the following overarching questions about service-learning:

• STUDENT IMPACTS
  
  Educational Success:  
  How well do students learn curricular content through service-learning?  
  To what degree does service-learning affect students' overall school performance?
  
  Civic Responsibility  
  How does a student's sense of civic responsibility change when he/she engages in service-learning?
  
• TEACHER IMPACTS  
  Why do teachers engage in service-learning?  
  To what degree does service-learning affect their teaching?
  
• IMPACTS ON SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS  
  To what degree are district personnel aware of service-learning, and how has this level of awareness changed?  
  How has service-learning advanced at the school, in the district, etc.?
  
• COMMUNITY IMPACTS  
  What impacts has service-learning had on the community?  
  To what degree have students provided a "service" to the community?

All CalServe partnerships are expected to address these overarching questions related to student impacts. In addition, partnerships should address the questions of at least one other impact area—pertaining to teacher, school/district, or community impacts. The report forms provided in the evaluation guidelines are designed to capture information that can answer these important questions about service-learning. However, partnerships have the option of using alternative methods of collecting data to address these sets of overarching questions.

Format of the Guidelines

Following an introductory section providing a definition of service-learning and potential outcomes described in the research literature, are two sections describing preliminary procedures such as obtaining parental consent and accessing and use of the report form templates.

The remainder of these guidelines contain a description of the report forms for partnerships interested in using that form of evaluation reporting. The report forms with their supporting materials are organized into two sections. The first section (Part I: Partnership Description) focuses on the collection of demographic and other programmatic data about the partnership. The second section (Part II: Findings) focuses on assisting partnerships in providing information about their sample sizes, data collection, data analysis, and findings. This section is divided in two subsections: Subsection A: Student Outcomes and Subsection B: Other Outcomes (teachers, school/school districts, or community).
As will be described later in more detail, the report forms (one for Program Description, one for each segment of Student Outcomes, and one for each segment of Other Outcomes) are each accompanied by a "descriptive overview" and "how-to information." The "descriptive overview" explains the nature and scope of the items on the particular Report Form. The "how-to information" provides guidance for the evaluation team on the gathering and reporting of data.

This easy-to-follow format should allow local evaluation teams more time to discuss the results of the data analysis, instead of spending their time trying to figure out what data to collect, how to collect it, and how to report it. The guidelines lay out most of the essential data that a local evaluation team will need to gather to best evaluate the outcomes of their partnership's service-learning activities. However, partnerships should feel free to tailor questions on the report forms to their own situations. Some questions, for example, may not be relevant to certain partnerships. Thus the report forms should not be seen as prescriptive, but only as a guide and resource for the collection, analysis, and reporting of data about the partnership's service-learning programs.
OVERVIEW

A General Definition of Service-Learning
Service-learning is a teaching strategy whereby students learn and develop through active participation in and reflection about organized service that meets needs of the community. Unlike community service, service-learning is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of students. The primary educational goals of service-learning are to enhance students' educational success and foster their civic responsibility.

Potential Outcomes of Service-Learning

For Students. Previous research and writing has indicated that service-learning may foster an even broader range of positive outcomes for students. The six domains most often mentioned are:

- Academic Development and Educational Success—more effective learning and understanding of the academic curriculum, increased motivation toward school, greater ability to analyze and solve problems, think critically, plan and evaluate activities, etc.
- Development of Civic Responsibility—enhanced awareness and understanding of social issues, broadened understanding of government and community, increased sense of social responsibility and citizenship, enhanced involvement in the community, etc.
- Career Development—increased awareness of career options, enhanced preparation for the workforce, understanding of workforce ethics, etc.
- Social & Interpersonal Skills Development—enhanced ability to work cooperatively with others, more tolerance and acceptance of diversity, improved prosocial behaviors, etc.
- Personal Development—enhanced self-esteem, self-awareness, and self-image, increased leadership qualities and skills, etc.
- Ethical or Moral Development—increased awareness of new points of view and perspectives, enhanced ability to make decisions regarding moral issues, strengthened altruistic and ethical value, etc.

For Teachers, Schools, and Districts. While research on service-learning has predominantly centered on student outcomes, educators and schools also are reported to benefit from such programs. More data should help confirm the extent to which service-learning has the following impacts on teachers and schools:

- Increases teachers' satisfaction with teaching and sense of efficacy
- Prompts the use of innovative teaching techniques
- Increases collegiality and professionalism among teachers
- Improves relations between teachers and administrators
- Improves teacher-student relations
- Improves relations among students, creating a better school climate
- Attracts community interest and support
- Facilitates achievement of school-wide goals; spurs school reform
- Fosters sense of community and common purpose among teachers, administrators, and students

For Communities. Because the service component of service-learning is intended to meet community needs and because there are many different contexts for service-learning activities, communities may benefit in a variety of ways from students' service-learning activities. However, in general, well-designed service-learning partnerships may:

- Improve services of community agencies; increase their capacity to take on new projects
- Build a more positive attitude towards youth in the community
- Strengthen the connection between the community and schools
- Stimulate community agencies to work together to solve community problems, and
- Help build a strong future generation of citizens and community leaders
federal and State Efforts to Promote K-12 Service-Learning

Reports of these important and varied outcomes for service-learning have prompted educators and policy-makers to seek ways to encourage the development of service-learning programs both at the K-12 and college levels. Administered by the Corporation for National Service, Learn and Serve America is a federal grants program that seeks to promote youth as resources through service-learning activities that address local priorities in the areas of education, public safety, the environment, health, and human needs. The California Department of Education (CDE) through the CalServe Initiative provides direct funding assistance to 36 school-community partnerships. It is the CDE’s vision that by the year 2000, 25% of all districts will offer community service or service-learning as part of their educational program; and that by the year 2004, 50% of all districts in the state will include service-learning as part of their regular instructional practice, engaging students in at least one service-learning experience at each grade span (K-5, 6-8, and 9-12).

The Role of Evaluation in Service-Learning Programs

Despite the fact that service-learning programs and partnerships have been funded through Learn and Serve America over the last eight years, little data have been collected that would substantiate or clarify the impacts of service-learning on students, teachers, schools, and communities. With the exception of one large national study and a handful of smaller state studies, little is known about the ways service-learning affects particular students in specific contexts. And while some of the studies mentioned above suggest that service-learning affects students' social and personal development, others report that students' academic and career development are predominately impacted. Moreover, there is little understanding about which components of service-learning are the most significant in fostering positive outcomes for students, teachers, and communities.

As CalServe partnerships seek to expand and institutionalize service-learning in their districts, information captured from well-designed evaluations can be instrumental in assuring the support of administrators, teachers, parents, and students who may be skeptical about the value of service-learning in K-12 education. In addition, if service-learning funding is to continue and if the CDE is to realize its goal of having 50% of school districts offer service-learning by the year 2004, then more definitive impacts need to be demonstrated. As the largest state and a state with a long history of efforts to institute and improve service-learning, California is in a position to move the field forward and provide the information that will help the country better understand the strengths and weaknesses of service-learning in our schools.

The CalServe Local Evaluation Process

Over the previous six years, evaluation criteria have been established by individual CalServe partnerships according to their local program focus and goals. The CDE’s CalServe Office has used data generated in these evaluations to review the individual partnership programs and has also attempted to examine findings across projects to determine trends in service-learning and in the CalServe initiative. However, because these various local evaluations have been topically diverse, their methods distinctive, and their samples not always representative, it has been difficult to find common threads among the partnerships and to make general statements about the outcomes of service-learning. In addition, the process of evaluation has often been after-the-fact and seen as separate from program development and improvement. Consequently, evaluation has not frequently been used by partnerships to increase understanding of how best to advance their service-learning efforts nor to develop ongoing information for improved decision making.
The current evaluation process was initiated for three reasons:

- To make the local evaluation process meaningful to local partnership participants in order that they might improve, enhance, and gain further support for their service-learning efforts
- To satisfy the requests of local CalServe evaluators for guidelines to help them prepare their evaluation reports
- To develop a statewide landscape of service-learning outcomes for students, teachers, communities, and schools/districts.

The 1997-2000 CalServe evaluations are focusing on the impact of California’s local K-12 service-learning initiative on students and on at least one of the other constituencies—teachers, schools, or communities. To facilitate these yearly evaluations, CalServe has been developing a local evaluation framework and a statewide evaluation system to guide local K-12 service-learning partnerships in collecting common outcome data across programs that can be aggregated for statewide evaluation. Though each partnership will contribute the set of evaluation data specified in these guidelines in order to create a statewide profile of service-learning outcomes, CalServe partnerships will be encouraged to continue to evaluate additional issues and questions specific to their programs.

This current effort to form and work jointly with local evaluation teams will be a success to the extent that:

- Local evaluation teams develop collaborative evaluation approaches that help them understand how to collect meaningful data that can advance their service-learning efforts, learn how to utilize technology to facilitate data collection and analysis, and gain an overall appreciation for evaluation and the way it can be utilized for continuous program improvement.
- California is better able to understand what is happening regarding service-learning through the development of a statewide profile, and the state is able to use that profile to more effectively use its resources to produce the best service-learning outcomes.
- A better understanding is gained of the extent and ways service-learning affects students, teachers, schools, districts, and communities.
PRELIMINARY PROCEDURES

Obtaining Your District’s Decision about Active vs. Passive Informed Parental Consent

State and federal laws exist to protect students from participating in research or evaluation without their knowledge, especially when such research might involve risk or harm (physical or psychological). While consent may seem most compelling within medical research, educational researchers and evaluators must also inform parents (and students, depending on their age and maturity) when students’ participation goes beyond the performance of ordinary school activities, when sensitive questions are asked, or when data from individual students are identified.

Since each district within California makes its own determination on what constitutes sensitive subjects and what criteria determine confidentiality, both the CDE and UC Berkeley’s faculty research committee have decided that the type of parental consent to be required for student participation in your local CalServe evaluation will be left up to your participating school district(s). The district decision essentially involves deciding between active and passive informed parental consent.

Active informed consent requires parents (and students) to acknowledge by their signature their willingness for the student to participate in the evaluation. Students who do not return permission forms would be excluded from the sample. With active informed consent all participants knowingly and willingly participate without ambiguity. However, because of the difficulty of getting permission forms back in a reasonable amount of time, active consent often reduces the number of students participating in the study by one-half to two-thirds, severely limiting the representativeness of the sample and the generalizability of the study. Often, active consent can be waived if the evaluation presents no risk of harm greater than that encountered in routine classroom activities and tests and if students’ rights and welfare are not affected, or if the evaluation is designed to study and evaluate public service programs.

If a waiver of active informed consent is granted, passive informed consent procedures should be instituted. With passive informed consent, parents or guardians or the student must notify the school if they are unwilling to participate in the evaluation. With passive consent, those who do not respond are assumed to be willing to participate in the study.

To assist you in obtaining a ruling from your participating district or districts, we are including a letter that you can forward to your district superintendent(s) to explain the options and provide materials to assist them in issuing a decision about whether active or passive parental consent will be required. We have suggested that you also provide district administrators with samples of the active and passive permission letters and with a copy of the report forms.

Adapting Permission Letters
The sample active and passive parental consent letters included in this packet provide a general outline that you may follow in producing your own permission letter. For legal reasons we suggest that you be sure to include information about the types of information to be collected (e.g., the Civic Responsibility survey, STAR test scores, attendance, etc.), the facts that parents may review a copy of the survey, that data will be kept confidential, that participation is voluntary, and that they may withdraw from the study at any time. But we also suggest that participating teachers make this letter more informative and less formal by including information about the specific content to be taught and service activities to be undertaken by the class.
Filing of Permission Letters

If any or all of the districts in your partnership require active parental consent, you will need to ensure that there is a permission form on file for each student whose data is included in your partnership's report. If passive parental consent is allowed, you will need to make sure that data from any student whose parent objects to participation is deleted from the reported data files.

Teachers may wish to administer tasks measuring content learning and civic responsibility attitudes to all students in their classes as part of their regular teaching. However, if active consent is required in the district, only those with permission forms on file should be included in the description of data for CalServe. Such permission forms should be retained at the district or partnership office by the evaluation team.

Assigning Code Numbers to Participants (Students, Teachers, etc.)

Each student, teacher, or other participant in the evaluation of your partnership should be assigned an identification number to protect the confidentiality of the data he or she contributes. The same identification code should be used for all data collected on each individual throughout the year. Each partnership's evaluation team should keep the master list of identification codes and corresponding names secure at the partnership site. That is, all reports forwarded to the CalServe office or to SLRDC should contain or cite data identified only by identification code numbers.

The foundation for every identification code will be each district's CDS code (the county-district-school codes established by the CDE and used throughout the state). Additional codes should be devised by each partnership to identify teachers and students. Please note that if more than one partnership exists in a particular county and district (such as in Los Angeles), the first set of seven numbers will be identical. We have therefore assigned an additional letter code to differentiate these partnerships.

If partnerships are unsure about the codes for participating districts or schools, they should consult the California Public School Directory (or call Mary Sue Ammon at (510) 643-7364). These CDS codes are also listed at the Ed-Data Internet site (http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/)

Each teacher participating in the evaluation should be assigned a unique two-digit number, as should every other school, district, or community participant in the evaluation. Student ID codes should include the CDS codes for county, district, and school, their teacher's ID code, and an individual two-digit student code within each class.

Control Groups

If possible, outcome data should be collected from "control" classrooms of students from the same or similar schools studying the same content as your target classes but not experiencing service-learning as a teaching/learning methodology.

---

1 For 1998-2000, the amended code numbers for the Los Angeles partnerships are the following:
Connections Project (Gardena & Belmont clusters) = 19-64733a, Literacy for All (Birmingham/Cleveland/Receda and Grant/Van Nyns clusters) = 19-64733b, Macay Middle School (San Fernando Cluster) = 19-64733c.
1998-99 CALSERVE LOCAL EVALUATION REPORTS: SPECIFICATIONS

The goal of each CalServe local evaluation report should be to describe the effects of the service-learning partnership on students and at least one other constituency—teachers, schools, district(s), and/or communities. Each partnership’s local evaluation report should be produced in a collaborative fashion by an evaluation team that has worked together to design the evaluation process, collect and analyze the data, and work on program improvement.

Each partnership’s evaluation report should contain two parts:

- **Part I: Partnership Description.**
  Part I should contain general information about the partnership. Included should be a short description of the partnership’s goals and objectives and its overall vision based on the 1997-98 CalServe proposal or renewal proposal. In addition, Part I should provide descriptive information about the district(s), schools, teachers, and students within the partnership. Multiple-choice items and guiding questions included on the enclosed report form (and on the Microsoft Word template) will clarify for the local evaluation team what information should be included.

- **Part II: Findings.**
  In Part II, the report should focus on outcomes that have been observed and that are inferred to be a result of the service-learning program. Part II has two sections:

  **Section A** should focus on results for students, especially as they relate to content learning and the development of civic responsibility. Other dimensions of educational success may also be included.

  **Section B** should focus on results for other relevant constituencies, specifically outcomes for teachers, school districts, and/or communities.

For each part or section of the evaluation report, three components are included in these guidelines to assist teams with the evaluation process:

- a descriptive overview
- a “how to” information sheet, and
- a report form

To report findings to CalServe, each partnership may either submit the information requested on each of the report forms or may generate a more traditional narrative evaluation report. If a partnership decides to use the report forms for its evaluation, they may be submitted in one of two ways:

1) Report form templates (in Microsoft Word) may be downloaded from the CalServe Evaluation Website to a partnership’s computer. They may then be filled out, modified or supplemented, and mailed in by the report deadline (June 30 for Partnership Description and September 30 for the remainder of the report forms).

2) A disk version of the report forms (MS Word for Macintosh or MS Word for Windows) may be obtained by calling Mary Sue Ammon at SLRDC (510/643-7364). The report forms may then be submitted either in disk or hard copy form.

Although partnerships are encouraged to include in their reports additional telling information about their programs that might be helpful to others, no information beyond that requested on the report forms is required. If a partnership chooses to include supplementary information about additional components, this may be done either in a more formal narrative report or in a form similar to that of the included report forms.
OBTAINING AND USING REPORT FORM TEMPLATES

Accessing Report Form Templates on the Internet

Partnerships wishing to submit report forms for their evaluation report may obtain copies of the report form templates directly from the CalServe Evaluation Website on the Internet. Any internet browser (e.g., Netscape or Explorer) will enable a partnership to access the computer at SLRDC that is acting as the server for the CalServe Local Evaluation.

| The CalServe Evaluation URL = nwp1.berkeley.edu (Internet address) | (or 128.32.166.11/pete's/index.htm) |

To try out the connection procedures and download the Report Forms on-line from the CalServe Evaluation Website, open your Internet browser and go to the Internet location indicated above. (Note: You do not need to login in order to download the templates.)

To download the templates, you must be using Microsoft Word 5.1a or higher for Macintosh or Word 97 or later for Windows. (See below part of the first Welcome screen in which Microsoft Word owners are invited to click on the link that will begin the download process.)

Welcome to the Home Page for the CalServe Local Evaluation

Microsoft Word owners! If you want to download templates for the report forms, click here. New compatibility Information!!

Obtaining the Report Form Templates on Floppy Disks

Partnerships that opt to use the report forms using the report form templates may also call or email Mary Sue Ammon to request a floppy disk version of the templates (510/643-7364 or msammon@nature.berkeley.edu).

Using the Report Form Templates

As a safety measure, we recommend that you immediately make a backup copy of each template.

To start filling in a template, simply click on a shaded area within a box and start typing. You will note that with a locked template you can type any amount of information into the form without disturbing the formatting of the document. You can also tab between entry sections to speed up your data entry. If you want to start again, you can simply delete an entire entry to get back to where you were in the beginning of that section, or you can erase single characters. Do not forget to save your entries as you go, because, if you close without saving, you will be back to an empty template.

If you want to alter a template by changing, adding/duplicating, or deleting words or sections, you will have to unlock it first, make your changes, and then save your changes. If you have made your changes before you enter any data, you can lock your template and use it in that form without worrying about disrupting the formatting of the template. However, if you have entered data before you unlock the template and change it, DO NOT RE-LOCK THE TEMPLATE or you will lose the data you entered before you changed the template. Simply continue to save your changes and enter data to the unlocked version (essentially now a regular Word document). Note that in some versions of MSWord, to unlock the template you may need to go to the Tools menu and select “Unprotect Document.” If at any time you are asked for a password to open or edit the template, type in “ms”
PART I: PARTNERSHIP DESCRIPTION

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this description is to provide general descriptive information about each partnership and its constituent district(s), schools, teachers and students. It should summarize the goals and objectives of the partnership and the nature of students' service activities. This overall portrait of the partnership should provide readers of the evaluation report with a context for viewing the strategies and procedures adopted by the partnership and the outcomes achieved. It should also help the partnership evaluation team think about the population of students and teachers currently participating in service-learning and those that it may want to try to involve in the next few years.

HOW TO LOCATE INFORMATION ABOUT THE PARTNERSHIP

The following are some tips for gathering and reporting information about your partnership:

1) Much of the narrative information for Part 1 (about partnership goals and objectives, about the community, about the district(s) and schools, and about the nature of the service-learning activities) may already have been included in the original or renewal proposal to CalServe. Information may be directly copied from that proposal as it is relevant to the questions posed in the Partnership Description Report Form.

2) Some of the demographic information about districts and schools may be obtained from CBEDS forms that are completed by schools and districts. Information from these forms are uploaded onto the Ed-Data site on the Internet and the resulting profiles are accessible at the following Internet address:  
http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/

   --For each district, the following information is available from Ed-Data:
   • Enrollment at each level
   • Ethnicity
   • Special Population Counts (AFDC, LEP)
   • ADA at each level

   --For schools, Ed-Data presents data for: enrollment, AFDC, free/reduced price meals, compensatory education, alternative education enrollment, ethnic groups, LEP groups, graduates, and dropouts. The school configuration of schools is designated (e.g., year-round, Title 1, charter). Counts and classifications of school staff as well as average class size for each level are included.

   --Also note that a link is provided to the tabled results of the STAR tests for the state, districts, and schools

3) Ethnicity, gender, (and information relevant to SES) about sampled service-learning students may be obtained from:
   • the cover sheet of service-learning students' civic responsibility surveys,
   • school records, and/or
   • the STAR data forms

Note that this information on the older students' Civic Responsibility Surveys and STAR forms will be self-reported by students. The STAR forms also may include information about parents' education which is relevant to the SES classification of students.

Remember: Please include (or check the accuracy of) your partnership's CDS code on the Partnership Description Report Form submitted to the Service-Learning Research & Development Center on June 30.
### Partnership Profile: (check one descriptor for each category)

1. **Type of Partnership**
   - New [ ]
   - Sustainable [ ]

2. **Location of Partnership:**
   - Primarily urban setting [ ]
   - Primarily rural setting [ ]
   - Primarily suburban setting [ ]
   - Mixed (describe briefly):

3. **Partnership Model:**
   - Multiple-District Partnership [ ]
   - Single-District Partnership [ ]
   - Cluster Partnership (High school & feeder schools) [ ]
   - Other (describe briefly): [ ]

4. **Context of Operation This Year:**
   - One School [ ]
   - Multiple Schools [ ]
   - Single Class [ ]
   - Multiple Classes, Single Grade [ ]
   - Multiple Classes, Multiple Grades [ ]
   - All Classes, Single Grade [ ]
   - All Classes, Single Subject at one Grade or Level [ ]
   - All Classes, Single School [ ]
   - Alternative educational setting [ ]
   - After-school youth [ ]
   - Other (describe briefly): [ ]

5. **Time of Partnership Operation:**
   - During the summer [ ]
   - During some portion of academic year [ ]
   - During the entire academic year [ ]
   - During the entire calendar year [ ]

---

### B. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND OVERALL VISION FOR PARTNERSHIP

(From proposal or renewal application):

---
C. INFORMATION ABOUT COMMUNITY CONTEXT OF PARTNERSHIP:

1. Approximate number and type of communities served by partnership:

2. Support of community for schools/district
   (Include whatever information is relevant, for example, community educational foundations, parent organizations and supportive activities, types of school volunteers, business or other organizational support for schools, etc.)

3. Other ways (beyond the service-learning units to be described) that students and schools serve the community (recycling, community use of school facilities, etc.)

D. INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOL DISTRICT
   [Duplicate this section for each district if you have a multiple-district partnership]

1. Identification of District:
   Name of District: ____________________________  CDS Code of District: ____________________________

2. Type of District:  
   Elementary [ ]  High School [ ]  Unified [ ]  Independent [ ]

3. Enrollment at each level:  
   K-8: ________  9-12: ________

4. Ethnicity of total enrollment (percentages):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>All Other:</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Special populations (as % of enrollment):  
   AFDC ________%  LEP ________%

6. ADA at each level:  
   K-8 ________  9-12 ________

7. Other relevant information (if any):

   ____________________________
E. INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOLS INVOLVED IN PARTNERSHIP
(Duplicate and complete this page for each school involved in your partnership)

SCHOOL #

1. General Information:
   Name: 
   District: 
   City: 
   CDS School Code:

2. School Demographics:
   Type of School: [ ] Elementary [ ] Middle/Junior High School [ ] High School
   Grade Levels: _______ _______
   School configuration: Year-round: [ ] School-wide Title I: [ ] Charter: [ ]

3. Student Counts:
   Total Enrollment: _______ AFDC Count: _______
   Free/red.prc.meals: _______ Compensatory education:
   Altern. Ed enrollment (# & description): _______

4. Ethnicity (as percentage of enrollment):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amer.Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific. Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. LEP Groups (as percentage of enrollment):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino(Tagalog)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Dropouts:
   Total Dropouts _______ School Dropout Rate: _______

7. Staffing:
   Total # Administrators: _______ Total # Teachers: _______
   Average Class Size (Schoolwide): _______

8. Other information (if any): _______
F. INFORMATION ABOUT SERVICE-LEARNING PARTICIPATION:
(Please estimate if exact counts are impossible to obtain)

1. Total number of students participating in the CalServe partnership _____

2. Number of students at each grade span:
   K-3: _______  4-5: _______  6: _______  7-8: _______  9-12: _______

3. Race/ethnicity of students engaged in service-learning (Estimate numbers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>All Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Estimate number of limited English proficiency (LEP) students engaged in service-learning:
   LEP: _______

5. Experience of teachers participating in this CalServe partnership evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Code</th>
<th># Years Teaching Experience</th>
<th># Years Service-Learning Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Average experience of teachers participating in this partnership
(Calculate or estimate, if possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Years Teaching Experience</th>
<th># Years Service-Learning Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Subject areas included in this CalServe partnership:

- [ ] Agricultural Education
- [ ] Industrial & Technology Education
- [ ] Art
- [ ] Interdisciplinary/Integrated
- [ ] Business Education
- [ ] Leadership
- [ ] Career Pathways/Exploration
- [ ] Mathematics
- [ ] Computer Education
- [ ] Music
- [ ] Consumer Home Economics Education
- [ ] Physical Education
- [ ] Dance
- [ ] Power, Energy, & Transp. Technology
- [ ] Drama/Theatre
- [ ] Science
- [ ] English/Language Arts
- [ ] Social Science/History
- [ ] Foreign Language
- [ ] Special Education
- [ ] Health Careers
- [ ] Visual Communications
- [ ] Health Education
- [ ] Other:
7. Total number of schools and classrooms participating in this CalServe partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># elementary schools</th>
<th># elementary classrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># middle Jr. high schools</td>
<td># middle school classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># high schools</td>
<td># high school classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># independent schools</td>
<td># independent school classrooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Description of Service-Learning Projects in Partnership

1. Primary services in the community provided by students (Check all that apply)

   a. Education
   - Reading to children in school
   - Reading to, teaching children in preschool/daycare facility
   - Organizing recreation or games for preschool children
   - Providing English as a Second Language (ESL) for adults
   - Providing English as a Second Language (ESL) for students
   - Providing tutoring for peers and younger children
   - Acting as mentors for other youth
   - Teaching classes or courses in school
   - Providing other school support (e.g., library, office)
   - Coordinating service-learning or community service activities
   - Other (specify):

   b. Health and Human Needs
   - Assisting with health assessments/exams
   - Providing health education (HIV/AIDS, etc.)
   - Providing instruction about tobacco use prevention
   - Providing instruction about alcohol abuse
   - Providing instruction about drug use prevention
   - Serving meals to homeless or low income individuals
   - Supplying other services to homeless
   - Providing job skills training
   - Providing language translation services
   - Providing companionship or chore support for elderly or ill or disabled
   - Providing companionship or support for special needs individuals
   - Providing companionship or support for hospitalized individuals
   - Other (specify):

   c. Public Safety
   - Mediating disputes
   - Teaching conflict resolution
   - Providing crime prevention or safety education
   - Modifying environment to prevent crime
   - Organizing/participating in crime prevention programs
   - Providing education about gang/dating/domestic violence
   - Organizing gang diversion srvs. (e.g., after-school, weekend youth programs
   - Assisting victims of violence or crime (peer, gang, domestic, child)
   - Providing education about public safety issues (fire, earthquake, floods, etc.)
   - Other (specify):
d. Environment

- Revitalizing neighborhoods
- Educating/informing people about environmental safety
- Assessing or eliminating environmental risks (e.g., lead testing)
- Implementing energy efficiency/conservation efforts (e.g., recycling, weatherization)
- Building homes or other structures
- Repairing/renovating homes or other structures
- Gardening (school, neighborhood, community)
- Assisting in economic revitalization or development
- Conserving/restoring public lands
- Constructing/maintaining trails
- Sampling, mapping, & monitoring natural resources
- Sampling, mapping, & monitoring wildlife
- Educating others about the natural environment
- Other (specify):

2. Primary Beneficiaries of Services Provided by Students
   (Check all that apply. Include primary beneficiaries only.)

- Preschool children
- Young adults (17-24)
- Educ. disadvantaged
- Physically challenged
- Low-income housing resdnts.
- Migrant workers
- Environment
- Veterans
- Other (specify):

- K-12 students
- Senior citizens
- Econ. disadvant.
- Homeless
- "At-risk" youth
- Families/parents
- Outdoor recreationalists
- Patients/nursing home resdnts
- Other (specify):

- College students
- General public
- Mentally disabled
- Unemployed
- Immigrants, refugees
- Business community
- School site staff
- Other (specify):

3. Brief Description of Selected Service-Learning Classrooms in Partnership

To report outcomes for Part 2, select no more than three (3) classrooms where service-learning was used. You should pick classrooms for which you have relatively complete sets of data (KWL, Anchor Tasks, Civic Responsibility Surveys, etc.). You may want to choose classrooms that represent the variety of your partnership—ones that differ according to the teacher's experience with service-learning, or that differ in terms of grade level, subject matter area, etc. Then answer the questions below (duplicating the classroom description on the following page for each of your selected classrooms).

How and why did you select the specially targeted classrooms?
CLASSROOM # ___ (Duplicate for each targeted service-learning classroom)

Teacher/Classroom ID Code: _______ Grade: _______

Subject Area in which Service-Learning was used to deliver the curriculum:

What were the intended curricular learning goals for the unit?

What was/were the service activities?

How was service integrated with the curriculum?

How would you rate the integration of service with the curriculum in this classroom?

High [ ] Medium [ ] Low [ ]

What were the reflection activities and how were they incorporated in the unit?

Overall, the choice about the service activity/activities was the responsibility of:
☐ The teacher ☐ The students ☐ Both teacher and students ☐ Other

How much input did students have in planning, implementing, and evaluating the service activities?
☐ Total ☐ Substantial ☐ Some ☐ None

What was the nature of the working arrangement for students?
☐ Whole class worked together ☐ Small groups worked together
☐ Pairs of students worked together ☐ Students worked individually

On average, how much time do you estimate was spent by each student on the service-learning unit?

______ in-class time learning the subject matter content
______ out-of-class time in the library, doing homework, preparing for service, etc.
______ out-of-class time performing service
______ time for reflection

H. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION ABOUT THE PARTNERSHIP : (OPTIONAL)


PART II: FINDINGS

The purpose of this part of the report is to help you document and reflect on the outcomes your partnership's service-learning activities have fostered for participants, particularly for students, teachers, school districts and communities. In Section A of Part II, all partnerships need to report on student outcomes regarding content learning, educational success, and civic responsibility. In Section B of Part II, partnerships have a choice about reporting on impacts of service-learning on another constituency—teachers, schools/districts, or community.

There are three types of student outcomes to be reported in Section A:
6. specific content learning by students
7. standardized achievement test scores, and
8. other measures of educational success, and civic responsibility attitudes.

Section A: Student Outcomes

Specific Content Learning: KWL and Anchor Tasks

OVERVIEW

All CalServe partnerships are expected to collect information about the relationship between service-learning and student educational outcomes. The two measures that should be used to assess students’ grasp of curricular content are the KWL and anchor tasks. The two tasks differ but complement each other. The KWL asks students to reflect on what they KNOW, what they WANT to know, and what they have LEARNED about a particular concept, topic or issue. The KWL is a reflective self-assessment by the student of his or her own understanding of content specified in the prompts. In contrast, the anchor task reflects the teacher’s assessment of the student’s understanding of concepts, topics, or issues upon which the student has reflected. The anchor task requires students to demonstrate that they indeed have learned what they said they have learned in their KWL self-reflection.

An Example

A 7th grade science class is taking part in a neighborhood beautification project that involves the selection, arrangement, and planting of California native plants. Before starting the project, the teacher asks students to write a short piece describing “What I know about California native plants” (the K of the KWL). After researching California native plants in the library and viewing examples in a trip to a nursery and a nearby landscaped park, students write a short piece on “What do I know and what more do I want to know about California native plants?” (the W of the KWL). After student groups work on different landscaping plans for planting the target area, they present and discuss the various ideas with a panel of community advisors and partners. When the landscaping project is completed, they write a short piece about “What I have learned about California native plants” (the L of the KWL). During a class period before the end of the unit, the teacher sets up a table of ten numbered plants and asks students to examine and then identify which are native and which are non-native California plants (The Anchor Task).

Analysis: Both the design and interpretation of KWL and anchor tasks depend on the learning objectives set by the teacher for the unit. The teacher should specify clearly which concepts and skills are the focus of attention, how much students might already know about the topic, and which previously learned concepts and skills might be built upon. After students generate their KWL pieces, teachers might, for example, score each student sample in the following way:
Sample Rubric

0= minimal or no relevant concepts discussed
1= 1 or 2 general relevant concepts discussed
2= 1 or 2 general relevant concepts discussed with specific information or examples included
3= more than half of targeted concepts discussed with examples
4= 75% or more of targeted concepts discussed with examples

Since the KWL samples will be collected at different points in the unit that is delivered through service learning (beginning, middle, and end), they may be used in a variety of ways. At the beginning of the unit, teachers may use the K pieces to evaluate their expectations about students' beginning level of knowledge and reassess their plans for the unit. At the midpoint, teachers may use the W pieces to evaluate which learning objectives have already been met and whether or not goals need to be modified. At the end of the unit, teachers may evaluate the L pieces in terms of the degree to which they show the attainment of learning objectives. KWL samples may be used to provide evidence and details of growth across time. That is, what individual students know about a topic at the beginning may be contrasted with what they know in the middle and at the end of the unit. Information from the KWL may also be compared with performance on the anchor task that assesses specific concepts or skills. Thus, what students report they have learned may be compared with their performance on a teacher-designed anchor task that requires application of that learning.
KWL TASK REPORT FORM
(Abbreviated)

This protocol is designed to help you answer the following overarching question:

• How well do students learn curricular content through service-learning?

At a minimum, the outcomes you detail should be related to the three service-learning classroom examples you described in the Partnership Description Report Form (Part I, Section G.3). Duplicate sections A-F on the following pages for each of the classrooms you include in your evaluation, and discuss and reflect on all three of your target classrooms in sections G and H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher-Classroom #:</th>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Subject Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. IMPACT QUESTIONS:
Describe the teacher’s objectives regarding concepts and skills to be learned via the units in which service-learning was used.

#1:  
#2:  
#3:  

B. SAMPLE:
1. Number & Gender of students completing KWL self-evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # Students in Class:</th>
<th>Ave.# Hours Service:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“K” Self-evaluations of knowledge before S-L</th>
<th>Total # Students</th>
<th>#Females</th>
<th>#Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“W” Self-evaluations of what students want to know</td>
<td>Total # Students</td>
<td>#Females</td>
<td>#Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“L” Self-evaluations of what students learned from S-L</td>
<td>Total # Students</td>
<td>#Females</td>
<td>#Males</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Racial/Ethnic Information about students completing “KWL” self-evaluations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. “KWL” self-evaluations</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/ African-American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/ Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/ Asian American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino/ Filipino American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Hispanic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. INSTRUMENTS USED: Provide the wording of the prompts used to elicit the KWL self-evaluations in this classroom.

Classroom 

- Prompt for "K" self-evaluations of knowledge before the unit using service-learning:

- Prompt for "W" self-evaluations of what students wanted to know:

- Prompt for students' "L" self-evaluations of learning from the unit using service-learning:

D. PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA:

1. Supply the following information about the dates of the elicitation of the "K," "W," and "L" and of the service activities for this classroom:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/Class Code Number</th>
<th>Date of &quot;K&quot; Self-Evaluation</th>
<th>Date of &quot;W&quot; Self-Evaluation</th>
<th>Date of &quot;L&quot; Self-Evaluation</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What comments (if any) did this teacher make about the administration of the KWL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/Class Code</th>
<th>Comments about Administration of &quot;K,&quot; &quot;W,&quot; or &quot;L&quot; Self-Evaluations Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. PROCEDURES USED TO ANALYZE DATA:

For each selected classroom, address the following questions:

* Who designed the rubrics used to score the "K," "W," and "L" pieces?
* Who scored the student self-assessments?
* What were the rubrics used to score the "K," "W," and "L" samples of writing? (Fill in only the number of levels used by each rubric's designer/s)

Classroom 

1. Who designed the rubrics used to score the students' KWL's? 

2. Who scored the KWL's for this classroom? 

3. Rubric used to score the "K" self-evaluations of knowledge before the unit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Rubric used to score the "W" self-evaluations of what students wanted to learn:

0 =
1 =
2 =
3 =
4 =

5. Rubric used to score the "L" self-evaluations of what was learned through service-learning:

0 =
1 =
2 =
3 =
4 =

5. RESULTS AND FINDINGS: Looking at the average KWL scores for this classroom, the distribution of scores, the qualitative nature of the responses, and subsequent actions by teachers and students, discuss the data from the KWL tasks, using the following questions as they are relevant.

Classroom #

1. Evaluating the Beginning Level of Content Knowledge from the "K" Reflection

What can be said about the students' beginning level of knowledge about the content, based on both the scores and the qualitative nature of their answers?

How did the students' responses affect the plans for the unit using service-learning?

2. Evaluating students' subject matter interests from the "W" reflections

What can be said about the students' interests or curiosities about the content, based on both their scores and the qualitative nature of their answers? Were any of these topics especially interesting or unexpected?

Were there ways that these student responses affected plans for the unit?

3. Evaluating students' assessments of their learning in the unit from "L" samples

What can be said about the students' ending level of knowledge about the content, given these "L" scores and the qualitative nature of their answers? How do their answers compare to those they gave at the beginning of the unit?

Were there differences in learning areas emphasized or valued by students and by teachers? How satisfied were the students with their own learning?
4. Comparing KWL Responses of Different Subgroups within each classroom
   a. Were there appreciable differences in the responses of boys and girls in this classroom on the “K” “W” or “L” self-assessments?

   b. Were there major differences in the way students in this class from various ethnic/racial groups responded to the three prompts?

5. Comparing “L” Responses with Scores on the Anchor Task
   a. How did students’ self-evaluations of content learning compare with their performance on the Anchor Task? Was there cross-validation of an area of learning? Were there any discrepancies?

   b. Do you have any hypotheses about discrepancies between the KWL and Anchor Task assessments of content learning? For example, can discrepancies be understood in terms of differences in the scope of the measures, differences in teachers’ and students’ goals or perspectives, etc.?

G. DISCUSSION OF THE KWL TASKS IN ALL THREE TARGET CLASSROOM:
   1. Overall Conclusions: What do the findings from the KWL tasks suggest regarding the impact of service-learning on students’ learning of subject matter content?

   2. Comparing Classrooms with regard to the Pattern of KWL Responses
      a. Were there major differences in the pattern of results of the “K” “W” and “L” tasks across the three classrooms?

      b. What factors do you think most accounted for differences (or similarities) in the results of the KWL tasks across classrooms (grade/age of students, gender or racial composition of the class, subject matter area, teacher experience, length of service or instruction, design or scoring of the tasks, etc.)?
H. RECOMMENDATIONS/NEXT STEPS

1. Program: In terms of the findings from the KWL Task about the impact of service-learning on student content learning, what are some program recommendations for the short term and the long term?

2. Evaluation: Are there aspects of the evaluation that need to be changed or revised in the coming year? (For example, do you recommend any changes in the way the KWL tasks are designed and administered? How effective were the rubrics in assessing levels of content learning? Do new instruments need to be employed to collect better data on service-learning’s impacts on students’ learning of content?)

3. Other (optional): Please discuss any other issues that have arisen from the findings of the KWL task or the evaluation process that might have influenced how the service-learning activities impacted students. (e.g., The students with some voice in determining their own learning goals seem to have been both more positive about service-learning and to think they have learned more from the experience).
IMPACT ON CONTENT LEARNING

Anchor Task Report Form
(Abbreviated)

This protocol is designed to help you answer the following overarching question:

• How well do students learn curricular content through service-learning?

At a minimum, the outcomes you detail should be related to the three service-learning classroom examples you described in Part I (Section G.3). Duplicate sections A-F for each classroom and summarize and discuss your observations about all classrooms in sections G and H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/Classroom #:</th>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Subject Area of S-L:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. IMPACT QUESTIONS:
Describe this teacher’s objectives regarding concepts and skills to be learned via the service-learning unit.

The collected data sought to determine how well students learned the following concept(s) or skill(s):

#1:
#2:
#3:

B. SAMPLE:

1. Number & Gender of students completing an Anchor Task in selected classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # Students in Class:</th>
<th>Ave.# Hours Service:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Students with Anchor Task data</td>
<td>#Females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Racial/Ethnic Information about students completing an Anchor Task:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/African-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American/Indian/Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino/Filipino American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Hispanic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. INSTRUMENT USED:
Briefly describe the task or instrument that was used by the teacher in this classroom to capture the impact of service-learning on students' acquisition of concepts or skills related to the particular subject matter. If possible, include a copy of each task in the appendices to your report.

Task/Instrument #1:

Task/Instrument #2 (if any):

D. PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA:
1. Supply the following information about the dates of the administration of the Anchor Task as compared with the dates of the service activities and the "L" student self-assessment in this selected classroom:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/Class Code Number</th>
<th>Date of Anchor Task Administration</th>
<th>Date of &quot;L&quot; Self-Evaluation</th>
<th>Date(s) of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What comments (if any) did the teacher from this classroom make about the administration of the Anchor Task?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/Class Code</th>
<th>Comments by Teacher or Evaluator about Administration of the Anchor Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. PROCEDURES USED TO ANALYZE DATA:
For each Anchor Task used, address the following two questions.
• Who scored the data that were collected?
• How were the data scored?

1. Task/Instrument #1:
   a. Who scored this Anchor Task data? ____________
   b. How were the data scored? _______________

2. Task/Instrument #2 (if any):
   a. Who scored this Anchor Task data? ____________
   b. How were the data scored? _______________
F. RESULTS AND FINDINGS:
   For each Anchor Task used in this classroom, address the three sets of questions.

1. What can be said about the students' ending level of knowledge about the content, based on both the Anchor Task scores and the qualitative nature of students' answers to the Anchor Task?

2. Were there appreciable differences in the responses of boys and girls in this classroom on this Anchor Task?

3. Were there major differences in the way students in this class from various ethnic/racial groups responded to the Anchor Task?

[Repeat Sections A-F for your other target classrooms]

G. DISCUSSION: Based on the data from all three target classrooms, answer the following questions:

1. Overall Conclusions: What do the findings from the different Anchor Tasks in your three classrooms suggest regarding the impact of service-learning on students' learning of subject matter content?

2. Comparing Classrooms with regard to the Pattern of Anchor Task Responses
   a. Were there major differences in the pattern of results for Anchor Tasks administered in the three classrooms?

   b. What factors do you think most accounted for differences (or similarities) in the Anchor task data across classrooms (type of task, grade/age of students, gender or racial composition of the class, subject matter area, teacher experience, length of service or teaching unit, design or scoring of the tasks, etc.)?
H. RECOMMENDATIONS & NEXT STEPS

1. Program: Based on the findings from all the Anchor Tasks about the impact of service-learning on student content learning, what are some program recommendations for the short term and the long term?

2. Evaluation: Do the findings from the Anchor Task suggest ways the evaluation might be changed or revised in the coming year? (For example, do you recommend any changes in the way the Anchor tasks are designed and administered? How effective were the Anchor Task scores in assessing levels of content learning? Are there ways to collect better data on service-learning's impacts on students' learning of content?)

3. Other (optional): Please discuss any other issues that have arisen from the administration or findings of the Anchor Task that might shed light on how the service-learning activities impacted students. (e.g., The students in the classroom that spent most time reflecting on their service activities appeared to gain a broader range of content knowledge).
Section A: Student Outcomes
Educational Success: STAR (Stanford 9 Achievement) Test

OVERVIEW

A central reporting requirement for CalServe partnerships is the documentation of impacts that service-learning has on students' educational success. In addition to assessing how well students master curricular content, evaluation teams are requested to address how well students who are engaged in service-learning perform in school.

For the 1999-2000 evaluation, partnerships are asked to collect Spring 1999 and Spring 2000 scores from the statewide mandated STAR test (the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition, Form T published by Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement). Results to be included are: for grades 2 through 8, scores in total reading, total language, total mathematics, and spelling; and for grades 9 through 11, scores in total reading, total language, total mathematics, science, and social science. The Spring 2000 performances of individual students and classrooms experiencing service-learning are to be compared to those of the previous year (Spring 1999) when a service-learning methodology was not employed.

On the STAR Report Form, partnerships are asked to provide (a) Spring 2000 scaled scores and national percentile ranks of the average student score for each subtest at each grade in their participating districts and schools, and to provide (b) Spring 1999 and Spring 2000 scaled scores, individual national percentile rank scores, and normal curve equivalent scores for individual students in the targeted service-learning classrooms.

HOW TO COLLECT STAR DATA

Scores for districts and schools as well as for the state are easily accessible via the "STAR Data Server" Internet site maintained by the California Department of Education. Scores for individual students and classrooms will need to be personally collected once student and classroom data are reported back to individual schools (sometimes not until late summer).

School and District averages may be accessed over the Internet through a link at the STAR site address (http://star.cde.ca.gov). Please note that, although the ED-DATA site allows access to STAR scores, the ones that are displayed via this site do not contain the scaled scores that are being requested for this evaluation. To obtain all the scores requested on the STAR report form, go directly to the above STAR internet server location.

Once at the main STAR server screen, select the year for which you want STAR scores. After the next menu pops up, select "Reports" on the left margin of the page. You will next be asked to select an index for the report you want—for example, a county index, a district index, or a zip code. Pick the district index and then on the next screen, pick the district whose scores you want to see. From this point you can choose to select and print either the district STAR profile or the STAR profile of schools within that district. Note: Be sure to select "Landscape" on the page setup when you print, since the page of scores extends beyond 8 inches.

The Internet report will show various scores for:

- total reading, written expression (language), spelling, and total mathematics for grades 2-8.
- total reading, writing (language), total mathematics, science, and social science for grades 9-11.

---

1 Based on mean normal curve equivalent scores.
After saving and printing the STAR report for your district(s) and schools (see earlier instructions), you will need to obtain the STAR result profiles for individual service-learning students in your selected three classrooms from their school records for both Spring 1999 and 2000.

Please Note: Scores for LEP students are listed separately for each district and school (on the page following the scores for all students).
**SECTION A.2 IMPACT ON STUDENT EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS**

**STAR Test Scores Report Form**

A. Sample and Results: You will need to look at average scores reported for districts and schools within your partnership in order to evaluate the performance of your service-learning classrooms. Use the scores obtained to fill in the following tables:

1. **District Scores** *(Duplicate Tables for Multi-District Partnership):*

   **District Code** ________  **District Name:** ________  **Year Administered:** 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS(^1) NPR(^2)</td>
<td>SS NPR</td>
<td>SS NPR</td>
<td>SS NPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS NPR</td>
<td>SS NPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year Administered:** 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS(^1) NPR(^2)</td>
<td>SS NPR</td>
<td>SS NPR</td>
<td>SS NPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS NPR</td>
<td>SS NPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. School Scores (Fill in a table for each school involved in partnership for both this year and last year—Spring 1999 and Spring 2000):

a. School Code: __________ School Name: __________ Year Administered: Spring 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reading $SS^a$ NPR$^b$</th>
<th>Mathematics $SS$ NPR</th>
<th>Language $SS$ NPR</th>
<th>Spelling $SS$ NPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Science $SS$ NPR</th>
<th>Social Science $SS$ NPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. School Code: __________ School Name: __________ Year Administered: Spring 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reading $SS^a$ NPR$^b$</th>
<th>Mathematics $SS$ NPR</th>
<th>Language $SS$ NPR</th>
<th>Spelling $SS$ NPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Science $SS$ NPR</th>
<th>Social Science $SS$ NPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Mean scaled score
$^b$National percentile rank of the mean National Curve Equivalent Score for each group
$^c$Mean scaled score
$^d$National percentile rank of the mean National Curve Equivalent Score for each group
3. Scores for Service-Learning Students. (Fill in two copies of this table for students in each selected classroom—one containing the Spring 2000 scores from this year and one containing last year’s Spring 1999 scores for the same students.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>School Name:</th>
<th>Year Administered:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom/Teacher Code:</th>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Subject Code for S-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student ID</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student ID</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average

---

7 Mean individual percentile
8 Normal curve equivalent score
1. Discussion

1. What do you notice about the Spring 2000 performance of the students in the selected service-learning classrooms in the subject area of their service-learning as compared to other students in their school and district?

2. What do you notice about the gains in the performance of the students in the selected service-learning classrooms in the subject area of their service-learning from Spring 1999 to Spring 2000 as compared to their gains in other subject matter areas?

3. Comparing Classrooms on the STAR Test.

   a. Were there major differences in the pattern of results for the STAR test across the three classrooms?

   b. What factors do you think most accounted for differences (or similarities) in the results of the STAR test across your targeted classrooms (subject matter area for service-learning, grade/age of students, gender or racial composition of the classes, design of the service-learning programs, etc.)?
Section A: Student Outcomes

Civic and Social Responsibility: Civic Responsibility Survey

OVERVIEW

Another major reporting requirement for CalServe partnerships is the documentation of impacts that service-learning has on the enhancement of students' concepts and attitudes regarding social and civic responsibility. Evaluation teams are requested to address the impact of service-learning on students' sense of civic responsibility through the administration of a survey before and after the service-learning experience or through the use of another locally-designed measure. To assist in this effort, the Service-Learning Research and Development Center (SLRDC) developed a Civic Responsibility Survey that was distributed to all partnership evaluation teams in 1997. The survey was designed to tap three constructs: (1) connection to and feelings of obligation to a particular community, (2) awareness of social and political issues and an attitude of willingness to take responsibility for service or social action, and (3) active demonstration of a commitment to be part of the solution of community needs or problems. To accommodate the varying abilities of students, three different levels of the survey were created—one for elementary school students (Level I), one for middle or junior high school students (Level II) and one for high school students (Level III). The levels of the survey varied in terms of the number and wording of items and the number of choice alternatives. During each of the past two years partnerships have been asked to administer the survey and then mail the raw survey data to SLRDC for tabulation and analysis. A Spanish translation of this survey was also developed in 1998 for partnerships with large numbers of non-English speaking students.

For the 1999-2000 evaluation, partnerships are again asked to collect data about the impact of service learning on civic responsibility by using either the 1997 SLRDC survey, a new survey developed in 1999, or some instrument of their own design. Unlike previous years, partnerships will be responsible for analyzing data from whatever instrument they select. (SLRDC will not be able to analyze surveys for partnerships in Spring 2000 because of the September 30 deadline for its own 3-year report to the California Department of Education).

PROCEDURES FOR ADMINISTERING THE 1997 SURVEY

Questions for each level of the survey are preceded by a cover page that requests background and demographic information on participating students. Partnerships should be careful to keep the cover pages attached to the questionnaire so that pretests can be matched with posttests and so that answers may be connected with variables such as grade, gender, ethnic background, subject matter for service learning, and length of time the student was engaged in the project. If partnerships are concerned with confidentiality issues, student's names may be blacked out after the student ID numbers are assigned and filled out on the cover page. (The ID numbers should be identical to ones assigned to students for other data collected in each classroom.) A classroom tally sheet such as the one contained in Appendix C is a convenient way to assign and keep track of the ID numbers as well as record the dates of data collection and scores of students on each measure.

If possible, the pre-surveys should be administered before the service is begun or even a description and rationale is given by the teacher for performing the service. If this is not possible, teachers should provide some details about what discussion took place before the presurvey was administered or what activities have been begun. Post-surveys should be administered immediately following the completion of service-learning activities.
SECTION A.3 IMPACT ON CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY

Civic Responsibility Survey Report Form
(Abbreviated)

This protocol is designed to help you answer the following overarching question:
• *How does a student's sense of civic responsibility change after engaging in service-learning?*

A. Sample: At a minimum, the outcomes you discuss should be related to the three service-learning classroom examples you described in the Partnership Description (Part I, Section G.3)

1. Number of control and service-learning classrooms & students completing pre and post-test Civic Responsibility Surveys (or other civic responsibility measure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Control Classrooms</th>
<th># Control Students</th>
<th># S-L Classrooms</th>
<th># S-L Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre CR Surveys:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post CR Surveys:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Number of control, service-learning, and total number of students completing survey (or other measure) in each grade and gender category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Student Sample</th>
<th>Service-Learning Sample</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. Control:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Number of Control & Service-Learning students in different racial/ethnic categories completing CR Survey (or other civic responsibility measure):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Service-Learning</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African/African-American:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino/Filipino American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Number of Service-Learning and Control students in various content area classes completing the Civic Responsibility Survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Service-Learning Students</th>
<th>Control Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Visual Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Pathways/Exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated/Interdisciplinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Instruments Used:

1. SLRDC Civic Responsibility Survey (1998 Version)

   Indicate number of surveys of each level and form that were administered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels: Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forms:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Other Measures Used, if any (e.g., Other surveys or instruments)

   Briefly describe any other instrument that was used to capture the impact of service-learning on civic responsibility of students.

C. Procedures for Collecting Data:

1. Supply the following information about the relative dates of the surveys and the service activities for each of the selected classrooms described in Part 1 (Section G.3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Code</th>
<th>Date of Pre-CR Survey</th>
<th>When were service activities performed?</th>
<th>Date of Post CR Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What comments (if any) did the teachers from the selected classrooms make about the administration of the Civic Responsibility Survey (or other measure)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/Class Code</th>
<th>Comments about administration of Civic Responsibility Survey (or other such measure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Procedures Used to Analyze Data:
What analyses were done on the data? Briefly describe them:

E. Results and Findings:
1. Once you analyzed the data from your measure of civic responsibility, what did you notice overall about the results with students in your partnership (especially looking at initial levels, pre-post differences, and service-learning/control differences)?

2. What does your data indicate about initial levels and changes in CR between:
   a. Students of various grades:
   b. Boys and girls:
   c. Students of different ethnic groups:
   d. Students in your three selected classrooms:

F. Discussion
1. Overall, what do the findings suggest regarding the impact of service-learning on the growth of civic responsibility in students?
2. Are there any patterns or correlations worth noting? (Were there categories of students for whom service-learning seemed to impact civic responsibility to a greater extent? Knowing what you do about your selected classrooms, what sense can you make of the results of your measure of Civic Responsibility with those students?)

G. Recommendations/Next Steps

1. Program:
   In view of the data on Civic Responsibility, are there any aspects of the service-learning partnership that should be modified? What would you recommend to improve the impact of service-learning experiences on students' development of civic responsibility?

2. Evaluation:
   Are there aspects of the evaluation that deal with impact of service-learning on civic responsibility that need to be changed? (For example: Do new instruments need to be employed to collect better data on service-learning's impact on civic responsibility? Are there other ways the data should be analyzed?)

3. Other (optional):
   Discuss any other issues that have arisen from the findings or the evaluation process that might have influenced how the service-learning activities impacted student's civic responsibility.
REPORT FORM
SECTION B: OTHER OUTCOMES

Section B will focus on outcomes for teachers, school district(s) and/or communities.

IMPACT ON TEACHERS
(Abbreviated)

At minimum, the outcomes you detail should be related to the three service-learning classroom examples you described in Part I (Section G.3).

A. Impact Questions

The data collected sought to answer the following question(s):

#1: 

#2: 

#3: 

#4: 

B. Sample

1. What is the sample size __________

2. Experience and subject area of teachers involved in the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Code</th>
<th>#Years Teaching Experience</th>
<th>#Years S-L Experience</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Instruments Used

Briefly describe each instrument or protocol that was used to capture data about impact of service-learning on teachers.

Protocol/Instrument #__:


D. Procedures for Collecting the Data

For each protocol or instrument used, address the following three questions.

1. Who collected the data about teacher impacts?
2. When were the data collected?
3. From what percentage of the sample indicated above were the data collected.

Protocol/Instrument #__:

1. Who collected the data? ________________________________

2. When were the data collected ________________________________

3. From what percentage of the sample were the data collected? ______

E. Procedures Used to Analyze Data

For each protocol or instrument used, address the following two questions.

1. Who analyzed the data that were collected?
2. How were the data analyzed?

Protocol/Instrument #__:

1. Who analyzed the data?

2. How were the data analyzed
F. Results and Findings

What did the data in each protocol and instrument show?

Protocol/Instrument #__:

G. Discussion

Overall, what do the findings suggest regarding service-learning impact on teachers? In what areas did service-learning seem to have the greatest or least impact? Are there any patterns or correlations worth noting, such as a relationship between teacher experience and service-learning's impact on teachers, or a relationship between level of service-learning integration with the curriculum and service-learning's impact on teachers?

H. Recommendations/Next Steps

1. Program:

In terms of the teacher impact findings, what are some short-term and long-term program recommendations? (Are there any aspects of the service-learning partnership that should be modified?)

2. Evaluation:

Are there aspects of the evaluation that need to be changed, or revised in the coming year? (For example: Does the evaluation team need to be expanded/changed? Do new instruments need to be employed to collect better data on service-learning's impact on teachers?)

3. Other (optional):

Please discuss any other issues that have arisen from the findings or the evaluation process that might have influenced how the service-learning activities impacted the teachers. (e.g., The teachers seem to have embraced service-learning because the district had a new superintendent who affirmed her support and enthusiasm for service-learning).
At a minimum, the outcomes you detail should be related to the three service-learning classroom examples you described in Part I (Section G.3).

A. Impact Questions

The data collected sought to answer the following question(s):

#1: 

#2: 

#3: 

#4: 

B. Sample

1. What is the sample size __________

2. Size, Type, and ADA of Schools included in the SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Grade(s) Involved in Service-Learning</th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>Subject Area(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Instruments Used

Briefly describe each instrument or protocol that was used to capture data about impact of service-learning on the schools/district(s).

Protocol #: 
D. Procedures for Collecting the Data

For each protocol or instrument used, address the following three questions.

1. Who collected the data about school/district impacts?
2. When were the data collected?
3. From what percentage of the sample (indicated above) were the data collected with each instrument?

Protocol/Instrument #__:

1. Who collected the data? ________________________________

2. When were the data collected? ________________________________

3. From what percentage of the sample were the data collected? _____

E. Procedures Used to Analyze Data

For each protocol or instrument used, address the following two questions.

1. Who analyzed the data that were collected?
2. How were the data analyzed?

Protocol/Instrument #__:

1. Who analyzed the data?

2. How were the data analyzed?

F. Results and Findings

What did the data in each protocol and instrument show?

Protocol/Instrument #1:
G. Discussion

Overall, what do the findings suggest regarding service-learning impact on school/districts? (In what areas did service-learning seem to have the greatest or least impact? Are there any patterns or correlations worth noting, such as a relationship between the level or size of schools and service-learning's impact on the school or district?)

H. Recommendations/Next Steps

1. Program:

In terms of the school/district impact findings, what are some short-term and long-term program recommendations? (Are there any aspects of the service-learning partnership that should be modified to enhance the impact of service-learning on schools/district?)

2. Evaluation:

Are there aspects of the evaluation that need to be changed, or revised in the coming year? (For example: Does the evaluation team need to be expanded/changed? Do new instruments need to be employed to collect better data on service-learning's impacts on school/district?)

3. Other (optional):

Discuss any other issues that have arisen from the findings or the evaluation process that might have influenced how the service-learning activities impacted the school/districts. (e.g., The evaluation looked only at those schools that have had longstanding service-learning activities. Therefore, the findings are more positive than they might be for the rest of the schools in the district).
REPORT FORM  
SECTION B: OTHER OUTCOMES

IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES  
(Abbreviated)

At a minimum, the outcomes you detail should be related to the three service-learning classroom examples you described in Part I (Section G.3).

A. Impact Questions

The data collected sought to answer the following question(s):

#1:  

#2:  

#3:  

#4:  

B. Sample

1. What is the sample size  

2. Type and Service Area of Community/Community agency included in the sample. Use one line per community agency. Repeat teacher code for multiple community agencies and service activities within a classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Code</th>
<th>Type of Community Agency</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Instruments Used

Briefly describe each instrument or protocol that was used to capture data about the impact of service-learning on the community.

Protocol #___:

D. Procedures for Collecting the Data

For each protocol or instrument used, address the following three questions.

1. Who collected the data about community impacts?
2. When were the data collected?
3. From what percentage of the sample indicated above were the data collected.

Protocol/Instrument #___:

1. Who collected the data?

2. When were the data collected?

3. From what percentage of the sample were the data collected? _____

E. Procedures Used to Analyze Data

For each protocol or instrument used, address the following two questions.

1. Who analyzed the data that were collected?
2. How were the data analyzed?

Protocol/Instrument #___:

1. Who analyzed the data?

2. How were the data analyzed?
F. Results and Findings

What did the data in each protocol and instrument show?

Protocol/Instrument #1:

G. Discussion

Overall, what do the findings suggest regarding service-learning impact on the community? (In what areas did service-learning seem to have the greatest or least impact? Are there any patterns or correlations worth noting, such as a relationship between particular types of service activities and the level of community impact?)

H. Recommendations/Next Steps

1. Program:
In terms of the community impact findings, what are some short-term and long-term program recommendations? (Are there any aspects of the service-learning partnership that should be modified to enhance the impact of service-learning on the community?)

2. Evaluation:
Are there aspects of the evaluation that need to be changed or revised in the coming year? (For example: Does the evaluation team need to be expanded or changed? Do new instruments need to be employed to collect better data on service-learning’s impacts on the community?)

3. Other (optional):
Please discuss any other issues that have arisen from the findings or the evaluation process that might have influenced how the service-learning activities impacted the community. (For example: Community impacts appeared minimal because the issues that the students addressed were large, broad-based issues that will require ongoing, long-term service efforts to affect)