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Executive Summary

This report examines and evaluates the effectiveness of the Idaho Learn and Serve program in the state of Idaho for the 2008-2009 school year. Fourteen schools were awarded the grants from around the state. The results of survey responses submitted by the grantee schools and the students within the program are compared in a pre-post format.

Methods

Surveys were administered in the fall of 2008 and again in the spring of 2009 before school dismissed for the summer. Fall survey responses were received from 14 coordinators who represented each of the grantees and from 123 of their students, 40 of whom were in grades 3-5, and 83 from grades 6-12. Post survey responses were received from 10 site coordinators and 81 students, of whom 9 were in grades 3-5 and 72 students in grades 6-12.

The teacher survey measured the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Concern</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Purpose</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Civic Actions</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Follow Through</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, Student, Parent Collaboration</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Action</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Questions</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey for students in grades 3-5 consisted of 8 questions centered on personal evaluation regarding civic action understanding and effectiveness. The older students in grades 6-12 responded to 20 questions regarding their place in the community, personal characteristics, and personal evaluation.

The reader should be aware of two methodological issues in this data. 14 grantees completed the pre survey; however, responses were received from only 10 of these grantees. Consequently, where appropriate and necessary in this analysis, scores have been weighted to help account for the missing data. The reader will be made aware when weighting is used in this report. Additionally, an analysis which includes a pre and post comparison might lack a certain measure of reliability. Ideally, a control group should be established and the pre and post survey responses from that group should be included in the analysis. Detrimental factors to reliability
are often in evidence in many other reports, but they are seldom documented and explained. In this report the reader is being made aware of these issues, however the reader need not doubt that the analysis presented here and the conclusions reached will provide policy makers with the needed information to make proper decisions and move forward.

Conclusions

This analysis has made several issues clear:

1. The data itself is not adequate to examine the effectiveness of the grant to the extent that is necessary. There were 14 sites which were grant recipients. All 14 site coordinators and their students completed the pre surveys, however only 10 site coordinators completed the post surveys, and none of the missing site coordinators’ students completed post surveys. The lack of adequate data created problems. A weighting strategy was used to compensate for the lack of data and results were obtained.

2. The available data allowed for an analysis of the changes in survey responses from the beginning of the school year to the end. That strategy might be adequate and in this instance could satisfy the policy makers and allow them to move forward, however it would seem apparent that the grant’s effectiveness should be related to success in school or higher academic achievement. There are many ways to establish that such results are occurring. Fundamentally a control group needs to be identified and measured just as the experimental group is measured, but the data to accomplish that end was not available for this analysis.

3. All the analysis indicated that there was not much movement in the survey responses from the beginning of the school year to the end. That is to say that apparently there were no changes to the students’ awareness of civic and community contributions and other aspects of personal growth that might have been expected to occur.

4. The data do not capture the effect on the students. They spent time with coordinators experiencing the grant’s curriculum, but the surveys do not measure changes. There is no doubt that the students are better off after being a part of this grant, but there is no indication of how they are better off.

Recommendations

1. Establish a contract with an evaluator prior to creating survey questions and allow the contractor to assist
   a. In the development of the questions, and
   b. In the methodology for distribution and collection of survey data.
2. Work more closely with the evaluator and allow a more in depth analysis than is possible with the current data.

3. Develop a plan to insure that all participant sites complete pre and post surveys.

4. Allow the evaluator to visit sites and meet the coordinators, and possibly utilize a focus group to broaden the database of information.

5. Broaden the approach of this analysis and consider expanding it to measure changes in academic achievement.

6. Determine what the ultimate goal of the grant funds is. Then create a survey that will capture the effects of the grant.

7. Add reliability and confidence in the results by establishing a control group.
Introduction

The Idaho State Department of Education established a contractual agreement with Frank Gallant and Gallant Analytics to evaluate the effectiveness of the Idaho Learn and Serve program in the State of Idaho. The analysis examines the available data in detail in a pre/post format. Statistical analysis was used to compare the sample of student response data that was provided. The site coordinator responses encompassed the entire database and statistical analysis was not used. The pre and post survey responses are compared and evaluated.

Organization of the Report

The report examines the effectiveness of the Idaho Learn and Serve program. First the methodology used is explained, and then response data from students and site coordinators is reviewed in a descriptive manner. Additionally, statistics and population analysis are used and conclusions are made about the program. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are provided.
Methodology

The methods of analysis are described in this section. Initially, the single question framing the analysis is explained, the sample of respondents is examined, and finally the procedures and instruments used in the analysis are described.

Evaluation Question

The single question that this analysis seeks to answer is:

Did the students who participated in this service learning project increase their civic knowledge and do their actions reflect this experience as measured by differences in responses to the pre and post survey questions?

It is difficult to evaluate the success of a program such as Idaho Learn and Serve with the limited data available. Had more data, both quantitative and qualitative, been available this evaluation would have been more encompassing. The author is concerned that the breadth of the program and its wider effects not evident in survey responses have not been captured in the available data.

Sample Selection Procedures

The site coordinators completed pre and post Climate Assessment surveys. The statewide population of site coordinators is identifiable and all available data has been applied to this analysis. Consequently, statistical sampling procedures are not used in comparing the Climate Assessment pre and post survey data. However four sites did not respond to the post survey Climate Assessment and a weighting procedure was adapted to compensate for missing data. Statistical testing could have been used to help account for the missing data, but only parts of site data were missing, and eliminating four sites entirely and reverting to a statistical procedure to evaluate responses would not have been the best choice. The amount of missing data was small, and in this situation it would be more accurate to adopt a weighting procedure and estimate the values of the missing data, than it would be to revert to a sampling procedure, eliminate entirely any data with missing parts, and then revert to statistical testing procedure to determine results. In view of the circumstances, use of the weighting procedure is the most accurate choice.

The Climate Assessment survey response data follow:
The weighting technique effectively increases the 10 post responses to 14, the same number as pre survey responses. This change is accomplished in the following manner:

1. If there are 14 pre responses and 10 post responses, then there are \( \frac{4}{14} \) fewer post responses.
2. Multiplying \( (1 + \frac{4}{14}) \), or 1.29 by the post survey response increases the post survey totals to the equivalent of 14 post survey responses.

The calculation has been applied to the post survey data. Additionally, it is applied to compensate for other missing data in this report.

The student surveys are truly samples and the survey responses represent only a portion of the students who participated in the Learn and Serve program. Some students at some sites did not complete pre survey data, and some did not complete post survey data. The number of post surveys was only about 60% of the number of pre surveys. The amount of missing data is significant, thus the available data is assumed to be a sample from the entire population. In this situation statistical analysis was used to estimate results.

An argument can be made that the data received is skewed in the direction of eliciting more positive responses than might be present in a “random” sample of completed surveys. Potentially only those sites that practiced fidelity to the entire program and provided excellent instruction and exposure to civic principles were the sites who returned the surveys. A population by definition is everything, and when a “population” is comprised of less than all the responses, then the sample “drawn” from that population may be skewed. There is no way to
determine if the data is skewed or the amount of skewness that may be present. The strategy is to be aware that it may exist and to keep it in the discussion as the results are interpreted.

The surveys administered at the beginning of the 2008-2009 school year included 14 sites and 123 students; as mentioned however only 10 sites and 72 students completed the post surveys at the end of the school year. The breakdown of sites and students is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Pre Survey Students Grades 3-5</th>
<th>Pre Survey Students Grades 6-12</th>
<th>Post Survey Students Grades 3-5</th>
<th>Post Survey Students Grades 6-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Center</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSER</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Elementary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Arts Charter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland High School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapwaii Elementary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaugh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Elementary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orofino High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma LC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma MS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorensen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell Middle School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site coordinator surveys

The site coordinator surveys were extensive and measured responses from seven general areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Concern</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Purpose</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Civic Actions</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Follow Through</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, Student, Parent Collaboration</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Action</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Questions</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The survey responses were measured on a 4 point scale, with an occasional *Does not apply* which was not ever marked as a response. The response categories were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Choices</th>
<th>Response Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Does Not Apply</td>
<td>No Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One additional response category scale was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Choices</th>
<th>Response Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final response category scale for the Climate Assessment was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Choices</th>
<th>Response Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Offered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered with Low Participation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered with Moderate Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered with High Participation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply</td>
<td>No Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is not a sufficient number of site coordinator responses to measure reliability. Reliability examines the consistency with which responders mark similar choices. These measures range up to 1.00 which indicates perfect reliability, or literally means that every responder made the same choice for an answer. Published reliability measures often range from .80 to .95. The site coordinator responses are consistently either a 3 or a 4. This level of consistency would tend to indicate a high level of reliability; but in this instance, an actual numerical estimate cannot be made. Reliability measures add depth to an analysis. Without this measure the analysis is still intact and the analysis of these questions will provide detailed information regarding the site coordinators' assessment of the efficacy of the Learn and Server programs over the past school year.
Student Surveys

The student survey for grades 3-5 measured personal decision making regarding civic and community engagement, and attempted to determine if students had the confidence necessary to follow through with action. These students responded to the following 8 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do things to help my town be a better place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have a problem, I usually think of solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what to do to make my town a better place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students my age can do things to make the world better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can make a difference in my town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to volunteer my entire life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am good at leading a group project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am good at speaking in front of a group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student survey for grades 6-12 measured similar aspects of civic and community involvement, but asked more involved questions appropriate for secondary students. There were questions regarding the effects of school in civic and community engagement, acquiring listening skills and evaluating what others were saying, responding in a manner in which made others want to listen. Also there were questions regarding the development of ideas and the communication of these ideas to groups of other people, and setting goals and following through to accomplish them.

The student response categories were of two types. The first was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Choices</th>
<th>Response Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One additional student response category was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Choices</th>
<th>Response Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Good At All</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the analysis of these surveys, policy makers will have information regarding the effects upon students of the Learn and Serve program over the last school year.
The format of the data prevented measures of reliability from being determined. The Learn and serve student pre and post data have many 3 and 4 responses which would indicate that there is a high reliability among responders, however it is impossible to produce the specific level of reliability present.

Results

Service learning projects were implemented in 14 sites throughout the state:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Arts Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapwaii Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orofino High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each site coordinator completed a pre survey and students from each of the 14 sites submitted pre surveys also. The post survey was completed by 10 site coordinators. Weighting was used to complete the missing data. Comparison of the pre and post survey data is completed. Post survey student responses were completed by students from 9 sites. The number of students submitting pre and post surveys was 123 pre-survey responses and 81 post survey responses. The student response data is a sample of the entire student population of Learn and Serve students. Consequently statistical analysis is used to establish the results.

Site Coordinator Survey Results

The site coordinator questions are listed below in an abbreviated format with the pre and post survey totals. The totals were obtained by multiplying the response value (1,2,3, or 4) by the number of coordinators that chose each response. For example, “Agree” has a value of 3 and if three coordinators chose this response, then the total would be 9. The responses of the coordinators were added together to obtain a total for each question within each broad category (1 through 7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pre Survey Response</th>
<th>Post Survey Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Civic purpose in mission</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Policies that focus on civic mission</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Resources to achieve civic mission</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Teachers collaborate to achieve civic mission</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Focus on civics knowledge</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 focus on skills to enable citizenship</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 focus on skills that enable students to be active citizens</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 focus civic disposition to uphold democratic society</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Debate and discuss</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Role play, mock trials</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Visit elected officials</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Write opinion letters</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Read from textbook</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Fill out worksheets</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Write reports</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Discuss current events</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Watch TV/videos</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Discuss TV/videos</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 Read extra materials</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12 Write answers to ?s</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Understand different people</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Cooperate with other students</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Solve problems in community</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 collaborate with adults to design projects</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 implement plans with adults</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Collaborate with adults on measuring success of projects</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Collect &amp; evaluate project data</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Reflect on experiences</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Community attends key school events</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Community members speak in classes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Well-coordinated volunteer efforts</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Partnerships w/community-based organizations</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13 Community partners plan school events</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 Community partners help students reflect</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15 Community support for service-learning at school</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16 District level support for service learning</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Activities that aid in learning about diversity</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Understand importance of cooperation among diverse students
4.3 Diverse students work with each other
4.4 Diverse students chosen by adults to participate in events
4.5 Students get to know each other well
4.6 Enjoy participating in school activities
4.7 Interested in getting to know other students
4.8 Enjoy working on projects together
4.9 Students develop strong bonds
4.10 Teachers are available for students
4.11 Teachers help students organize
4.12 students display interest in classes
4.13 Teachers go out of way to help
4.14 Teachers help students catch up after absence
4.15 Teachers take personal interest
4.16 Teachers encourage civic mission
4.17 Teachers can explain activities that support civics
4.18 Teachers enjoy developing citizenship activities
4.19 Teachers collaborate about practice
4.20 Parents support civic activities
4.21 Parents provide civic opportunities
4.22 Parents collaborate w/ teachers on civic matters
4.23 Parents have voice in school
4.24 Parents serve in school

5.1 Students assist in decision making
5.2 Students have a voice in school
5.3 Students assist in school rules
5.4 Teachers are receptive to students input in learning
5.5 Students help decide class time
5.6 Student reps enhance operations
5.7 Positive changes when students work together
5.8 Student groups help solve problems
5.9 Students acting together have more influence

6.1 Students are encouraged to form opinions
6.2 Students feel free to disagree w/teachers about social issues
6.3 Teachers respect students opinion
6.4 Students feel free to express opinions
6.5 Teachers encourage students to express opinions
6.6 Teachers present several sides to issue

7.1 Student council student government
7.2 Group prepares school newspaper
7.3 Student exchange
7.4 Organization that promotes human rights
If each of the 7 broad response categories is summed, then the totals for each will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Areas</th>
<th>Pre-Survey Totals</th>
<th>Post Survey Totals</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Civic Purpose</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frequency of Civic Actions</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Planning and Follow Through</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teacher, Student, Parent Collaboration</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Student Leadership</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student Action</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These totals and percentage changes are interesting. Broad areas 1, 3, 5, 6, and 7 remained approximately the same from the pre-survey to the post-survey. The expectation is that these scores would increase from pre to post. These did not, but they did not decline or increase very much either. The response changes to broad category 2 and 4 are of more concern. Frequency of civic actions has declined nearly 9.8% and collaboration among teachers, students, and parents has declined 5.4%. The data do not offer any insight into potential reasons for these declines.
Student Survey Results for Grades 3-5

There were 8 questions for students in grades 3-5. These questions are listed in the table below with totals for pre and post survey results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Areas</th>
<th>Pre-Survey Totals</th>
<th>Post Survey Totals</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I do things to help my town be a better place</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If I have a problem, I usually think of solutions</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I know what to do to make my town a better place</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students my age can do things to make the world better</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>-13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I can make a difference in my town</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I intend to volunteer my entire life</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am good at leading a group project</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am good at speaking in front of a group</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These responses generally decline from the pre survey to the post survey. These responses are a sample of the total student population within the grant, and it is necessary that a statistical test be completed to determine if the differences between the pre-survey and post-survey totals are due
to sampling error or to a true difference between pre and post scores. The statistical test that is used is an independent samples \( t \)-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>132.50</td>
<td>7.464</td>
<td>2.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>124.38</td>
<td>8.863</td>
<td>3.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean values are quite a bit different which lends to the probability that the scores are truly different. However, first Levine’s Test must be completed and a non-significant result (sig. > .05) must be obtained in order to proceed with the analysis.

**Levene's Test for Equality of Variances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A valid result is obtained from Levene’s Test. The \( t \)-test to determine if error has created the differences in the means reveals the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.983</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A result with a significance level of .067 is a borderline value. The usual, accepted critical decision level of significance is .05. Even if one accepts .05 as the decision value, statistical analysis has some flexibility. The .05 value and in this case the .067 value are only estimates themselves, and consequently it would be unwise to make a definitive statement regarding the difference in these mean values. The appropriate statement is:

It is unclear if the means are different, but there seems to be a decline in the post survey scores which is unexpected. The data might indicate that the students have not gained a deeper understanding of civic action and attitudes.
The following chart depicts the pre/post results:

![Student Pre/Post Survey Grades 3-5]

Student Survey Results for Grades 6-12

There were 20 questions for students in grades 6-12. The questions in an abbreviated format are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Response Areas</th>
<th>Pre-Survey Totals</th>
<th>Post Survey Totals</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I do things to make the community better</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am aware of the needs in the community</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I try to encourage others to work on community problems</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students my age can do things to make the world better</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I can make a difference in my town</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel responsible for helping others</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I intend to volunteer throughout my life</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Designing &amp; implementing a service project</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Finding resources to help with a community project</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Leading a group project</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Understanding what other people are trying</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to say

12 Getting others to listen to my ideas 220 225 2.2%
13 Speaking in front of groups of people 206 212 3.0%
14 Accomplishing goals 258 259 0.5%
15 Seeing consequences of actions 246 261 5.9%
16 Finding information to solve problems 246 246 -0.2%
17 Solving problems 253 246 -2.9%
18 Looking at media sources to find out community problems 204 206 1.2%
19 Using what I learned in school to solve problems in community 227 231 1.6%
20 Finding which govt. offices deal with which problems 167 169 1.5%

These responses appear to be approximately the same from pre to post surveys. As with the elementary students, these responses are also a sample of the total student population within the grant, and it is again necessary that a statistical test be completed to determine if the differences between the pre-survey and post-survey totals are due to sampling error or to a true difference between pre and post scores. The statistical test that is used is an independent samples t-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>242.80</td>
<td>32.908</td>
<td>7.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>246.75</td>
<td>32.499</td>
<td>7.267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean values for the pre survey results are very close to the post survey mean values. This closeness indicates that there is in fact no difference in the two means. Once again a t-test will provide more clarity. However as previously, Levine’s Test must be completed and a non-significant result (sig. > .05) must be obtained in order to proceed in this manner.

Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A valid result is obtained from Levene’s Test. The t-test to determine if error has created the differences in the means reveals the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This result with a significance level of .705 unquestionably indicates that the post survey results are not different than the pre survey results. The appropriate statement about this result is:

These survey results for students in grades 6-12 indicate that the responses to the questions have not changed over the course of the school year.

The chart depicts these results:
Conclusions

This analysis has made several issues clear:

1. The data itself is not adequate to examine the effectiveness of the grant to the extent that is necessary. There were 14 sites which were grant recipients. All 14 site coordinators and their students completed the pre surveys, however only 10 site coordinators completed the post surveys, and none of the missing site coordinators’ students completed post surveys. The lack of adequate data created problems. A weighting strategy was used to compensate for the lack of data and results were obtained.

2. The available data allowed for an analysis of the changes in survey responses from the beginning of the school year to the end. That strategy might be adequate and in this instance could satisfy the policy makers and allow them to move forward, however it would seem apparent that the grant’s effectiveness should be related to success in school or higher academic achievement. There are many ways to establish that such results are occurring. Fundamentally a control group needs to be identified and measured just as the experimental group is measured, but the data to accomplish that end was not available for this analysis.

3. All the analysis indicated that there was not much movement in the survey responses from the beginning of the school year to the end. That is to say that apparently there were no changes to the students’ awareness of civic and community contributions and other aspects of personal growth that might have been expected to occur.

4. The data do not capture the effect on the students. They spent time with coordinators experiencing the grant’s curriculum, but the surveys do not measure changes. There is no doubt that the students are better off after being a part of this grant, but there is no indication of how they are better off.
Recommendations

1. Establish a contract with an evaluator prior to creating survey questions and allow the contractor to assist
   a. In the development of the questions, and
   b. In the methodology for distribution and collection of survey data.

2. Work more closely with the evaluator and allow a more in depth analysis than is possible with the current data.

3. Develop a plan to insure that all participant sites complete pre and post surveys.

4. Allow the evaluator to visit sites and meet the coordinators, and possibly utilize a focus group to broaden the database of information.

5. Broaden the approach of this analysis and consider expanding it to measure changes in academic achievement.

6. Determine what the ultimate goal of the grant funds is. Then create a survey that will capture the effects of the grant.

7. Add reliability and confidence in the results by establishing a control group.