

5-1996

Evaluation of Learn and Serve America, Higher Education: First Year Report, Volume I

Maryann Jacobi Gray

Sandra Geschwind

Elizabeth Henegan Ondaatje

Abby Robyn

Stephen P. Klein

See next page for additional authors

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

 Part of the [Service Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gray, Maryann Jacobi; Geschwind, Sandra; Ondaatje, Elizabeth Henegan; Robyn, Abby; Klein, Stephen P.; Sax, Linda J.; Astin, Alexander W.; Astin, Helen S.; Kaganoff, Tessa; and Rosenblatt, Kathy, "Evaluation of Learn and Serve America, Higher Education: First Year Report, Volume I" (1996). *Evaluation/Reflection*. 57.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceeval/57>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Barbara A. Holland Collection for Service Learning and Community Engagement (SLCE) at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Evaluation/Reflection by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



Authors

Maryann Jacobi Gray, Sandra Geschwind, Elizabeth Henegan Ondaatje, Abby Robyn, Stephen P. Klein, Linda J. Sax, Alexander W. Astin, Helen S. Astin, Tessa Kaganoff, and Kathy Rosenblatt

Astin, Alexander

Rand Survey - 1996

RAND

*Evaluation of Learn and Serve
America, Higher Education: First
Year Report, Volume I*

*Maryann Jacobi Gray, Sandra Geschwind,
Elizabeth Heneghan Ondaatje, Abby Robyn,
Stephen P. Klein (RAND) and Linda J. Sax,
Alexander W. Astin, Helen S. Astin (UCLA)*

with Tessa Kaganoff and Kathy Rosenblatt

PM-528/2-1-IET

May 1996

Institute on Education and Training

PREFACE

This report presents evaluation results for the first year of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education (LSAHE) initiative, sponsored by the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNS). It addresses impacts of LSAHE on communities, higher education institutions, and service providers.

The first year assessment of LSAHE impacts on students providing volunteer service was conducted by the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute, under contract to RAND. UCLA authored Chapter 5, "What were LSAHE Impacts on Student Volunteers?" RAND is responsible for all other chapters in this report.

The final reports about this evaluation, to be produced in Spring 1997, will provide assessments based on three years of data collection and observation.

This report serves three audiences. First, the findings offer feedback that can help CNS plan for the future of LSAHE. Second, national policymakers may find the results relevant to decisionmaking about future federal support for LSAHE. Third, higher education administrators and practitioners may find the report useful for program and policy development at the campus level.



CONTENTS

List of Tables	vii
Executive Summary.....	ix
Acknowledgments.....	xiii
1. Introduction	1
A. Background	1
B. National Evaluation of LSAHE	3
C. Data Collection in 1994-95.....	5
D. Organization of This Report.....	5
2. What Work was Performed by LSAHE Programs?	7
A. Description of Responding LSAHE Programs	7
B. Program Accomplishments in Capacity Building	11
Creating Service Learning Courses	11
Providing Training and Technical Assistance	13
Establishing Clearinghouses, Databases, and Other Information Resources.....	13
Awarding Subgrants.....	13
C. LSAHE Program Accomplishments in Direct Service	13
Numbers of Service Providers, Hours, and Recipients.....	14
Community Needs Addressed.....	14
Specific Accomplishments	16
D. Chapter Summary	18
Grantees are Highly Diverse	18
Subgranting Greatly Extended the “Reach” of LSAHE.....	18
LSAHE Staff Spent Most Time on Capacity Building.....	18
Integrating Service Learning into Curricula was the Single Most Common Capacity Building Activity	18
Two-thirds of Respondents Also Provided Technical Assistance	19
Most Programs Engaged in Direct Service.....	19
Direct Services Spanned All CNS Priority Areas	19
3. What were LSAHE Impacts on Community Organizations and Service Recipients?	21
A. Approach to the Evaluation of Impacts on Service Recipients.....	21
Caveats	22
Organization of the Chapter	22
B. Description of the Community Organizations.....	22
Characteristics of Community Organizations in the Sample.....	22
Student Volunteer Activities Within Community Organizations	23

C. Impacts of Student Volunteers on Community Organizations	24
D. Impacts of Student Volunteers on Direct Recipients of Service	26
E. Community Organization Assessments of Student Volunteers.....	29
Assessments of Student Volunteers' Skills and Attitudes	29
Comparison to Other Service Providers.....	31
Global Ratings of Student Volunteers from LSAHE Institutions	32
F. Chapter Summary	32
Community Organizations are Highly Diverse.....	32
Student Volunteers Received Strong Positive Ratings.....	33
Student Volunteers Had Distinct Strengths and Weaknesses	33
Student Volunteers Were Comparable to Paid Staff.....	33
Discussion.....	33
4. What were LSAHE Impacts on Institutions?.....	35
A. Conceptual Framework for Assessing Institutional Impacts	35
Challenges in Assessing Institutional Impacts.....	35
Toward a Conceptual Framework for Institutional Impacts.....	36
B. Baseline Data on LSAHE Impacts on Institutions	38
How Colleges and Universities Support Service Programs.....	38
C. Chapter Summary.....	41
5. What were LSAHE Impacts on Student Volunteers?	43
A. Survey Design and Sample	43
B. Who Participated in Service?.....	42
C. Characteristics of Service Involvement	45
D. Service Participation and Student Outcomes	49
Outcome Variables.....	49
Civic Responsibility	49
Academic Development.....	51
Life Skills.....	54
E. Effects of Service Participation.....	56
F. Duration and Sponsorship of Service	60
Effects of Duration of Service	61
Sponsorship of Service	62
G. Chapter Summary	65
Most Students Participated in Service as a Co-curricular Activity	65
When Compared with Nonparticipants, Service Participants	
Exhibited Higher Levels of Civic Responsibility, Academic	
Achievement, and Life Skills	65
Participation in Service was Positively Associated with	
35 Outcome Variables	65

6. Summary of Major Findings	67
A. What Work was Performed by LSAHE Programs?.....	66
B. What were LSAHE Impacts on Service Recipients?.....	67
C. What were LSAHE Impacts on Institutions?.....	68
D. What were LSAHE Impacts on Service Providers?.....	69
Appendix A: Annual Accomplishments Survey Methodology.....	A-1
Appendix B: Supplemental Results: Annual Accomplishments Survey	B-1
Appendix C: Community Impact Survey Methodology	C-1
Appendix D: Supplemental Results: Community Impact Survey.....	D-1
Appendix E: Site Visit Methodology	E-1
Appendix F: Student Volunteer Evaluation Methodology	F-1
Appendix G: Identified and Nonidentified Participants	G-1
Appendix H: Complete Regression Results	H-1
Appendix I: References	I-1



TABLES

Table 1.1: Relationship Between Data Collection Activities and the LSAHE Evaluation Questions	4
Table 2.1: Profile of LSAHE Programs Responding to the Annual Accomplishments Survey	9
Table 2.2: Percentage of Staff Time Spent on Various Activities.....	10
Table 2.3: Percentage of Programs Including Various Capacity Building Components	11
Table 2.4: Percentage of Programs with Service Learning Courses by Discipline.....	12
Table 2.5: Percentage of Programs Working in Eight Service Areas.....	15
Table 3.1: Average Service Hours and Number Served by Student Volunteers.....	23
Table 3.2: Mean Ratings of How Student Volunteers Affected Community Organizations' Activities and Services.....	25
Table 3.3: Mean Ratings of Student Volunteers' Effectiveness in Serving Community Organizations	26
Table 3.4: Mean Ratings of Student Volunteers' Effectiveness in Providing Educational Services	27
Table 3.5: Mean Ratings of Student Volunteers' Effectiveness in Providing Health and Human Needs Services	27
Table 3.6: Mean Ratings of Student Volunteers' Effectiveness in Providing Public Safety and Legal Services	28
Table 3.7: Mean Ratings of Student Volunteers' Effectiveness in Enhancing Natural or Neighborhood Environments.....	28
Table 3.8: Mean Ratings of Student Volunteer Characteristics.....	30
Table 3.9: Mean Ratings of Student Volunteers Compared to Other Service Providers	31
Table 4.1: How Institutional Support in Four Domains is Expected to Promote Quality, Sustainability, and Centrality of Service	38
Table 4.2: Percentage of LSAHE Institutions in Accomplishments Survey Offering Support for Service Learning and the Percentage Implementing New Support <i>After</i> LSAHE	40
Table 4.3: Percentage Change in Community Relations Activities Since LSAHE Program Began	41
Table 5.1: Key Pretest Differences Between Service Participants and Nonparticipants	45
Table 5.2: Service Participation by Category of Service	45
Table 5.3: Service Participation by Type of Service Activity	46
Table 5.4: Service Participation by Location of Service	47

Table 5.5: Service Participation by Type of Collegiate Sponsorship	48
Table 5.6: Service Participation by Duration of Service	48
Table 5.7: Service Participation by Reasons for Participation	49
Table 5.8: Outcome Area: Civic Responsibility	51
Table 5.9: Change During College: Civic Responsibility.....	52
Table 5.10: Outcome Area: Academic Development.....	54
Table 5.11: Change During College: Academic Development	55
Table 5.12: Outcome Area: Life Skills	56
Table 5.13: Change During College: Life Skills.....	57
Table 5.14: Effects of Service Participation on Civic Responsibility	58
Table 5.15: Effects of Service Participation on Academic Development.....	59
Table 5.16: Effects of Service Participation on Life Skills	60
Table 5.17: Significant Effects of Duration of Service.....	62
Table 5.18: Significant Effects of Sponsorship of Service.....	64

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Learn and Serve America, Higher Education (LSAHE), an initiative of the Corporation for National Service (CNS), emphasizes the links between service and academic learning by encouraging postsecondary students to participate in community service. LSAHE strives to: (1) serve the educational, health-related, public safety, and environmental needs of communities; (2) enhance students' academic learning; and (3) build organizational support for service within higher education and community-based organizations. To achieve these goals, CNS awards grants to higher education institutions and community organizations. In fiscal 1995, which was the first year of operation for LSAHE, CNS awarded \$9.5 million to 116 grantees.

The authorizing legislation for CNS requires evaluation of LSAHE impacts on communities and service providers (i.e., student volunteers). CNS contracted with RAND to conduct the national evaluation of LSAHE. The evaluation includes a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods including site visits and surveys of program directors, community organization staff, students and faculty¹. The evaluation is expected to continue for three years, from the 1995 through the 1997 fiscal years.

This report presents results based on the first year's data collection. Data sources included: (1) An Annual Accomplishments Survey, administered to program directors; (2) A Community Impact Survey, administered to staff from community organizations serving as host sites for college student volunteers; (3) A longitudinal survey of students enrolled in institutions receiving LSAHE grants; and (4) 10 site visits to diverse grantees.

WHAT WORK WAS PERFORMED BY LSAHE PROGRAMS?

A spring 1995 questionnaire completed by 341 program directors (78 percent of those surveyed) identified the major activities and accomplishments of LSAHE grantees. Results indicate that all respondents engaged in activities designed to build institutional capacity for service programs, mostly by integrating service into academic courses, providing technical assistance, and producing publications.

Additionally, slightly more than four out of every five respondents involved students in direct service to communities. The largest share of direct service was in education,

¹ Student and faculty surveys were conducted by the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute, under subcontract to RAND.

although services also spanned health, public safety, and environment. Most programs worked in multiple areas.

WHAT WERE LSAHE IMPACTS ON SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS AND RECIPIENTS?

A spring 1995 questionnaire completed by 443 staff from community and government agencies and schools assessed the contributions of student volunteers in schools receiving LSAHE grants. Community organizations responding to the survey perceived the student volunteers as highly effective in helping their organizations and meeting the needs of service recipients. On average, responding organizations received 64 hours of service per month from the student volunteers. Due to the efforts of the volunteers, these organizations were able to improve the quality, intensity, and variety of services provided and increase the number of service recipients. Organizations also rated student volunteers as highly effective in promoting positive outcomes for service recipients across the four areas of community need identified by CNS: education, health and human needs, public safety, and environment. Volunteers from schools with LSAHE grants were perceived as more effective than other volunteers and equally effective as paid staff. The volunteers' greatest strengths were enthusiasm and interpersonal skills, particularly in working with youth. Their greatest weakness was the limited time they had available for volunteering due to the competing demands of school, extracurricular activities, and (often) employment.

WHAT WERE LSAHE IMPACTS ON INSTITUTIONS?

In this first year, the LSAHE evaluation developed a conceptual framework for measuring institutional impacts that divides organization support for service learning into four domains: organizational structure and resources, campus culture, curriculum, and community relations. Increased support within and across these domains is expected to improve program quality, increase the likelihood of program continuation after funding expires, and expand the number of service providers.

Baseline data indicate that LSAHE colleges and universities supported service learning in a variety of ways. Almost all (92%) institutions responding to the Annual Accomplishments Survey had integrated service into curriculum. Three quarters housed a volunteer or service learning center and offered rewards for student and faculty involvement in service. On the other hand, less than one-third included service in the

institution's core curriculum, and fewer than half had full-time staff assigned to service programs.

The implementation of LSAHE was associated with growing support for service learning and stronger relations between colleges and community organizations. Progress was observed in the development of service learning courses and in faculty involvement in service learning. Additionally, community organizations responding to the Community Impact Survey indicated increasing cooperation and collaboration with LSAHE schools.

WHAT WERE LSAHE IMPACTS ON STUDENT SERVICE PROVIDERS?

Survey responses from 3,450 students attending institutions with LSAHE grants provided an opportunity to compare service participants and nonparticipants in three areas: civic responsibility, academic development, and life skills. Results indicate statistically significant positive effects of service participation within each area. Students participating in service at LSAHE-funded institutions reported higher net gains (or lower net losses) than nonparticipants in such measures of civic responsibility as commitment to helping others, promoting racial understanding, and influencing social values and political structures. Student service providers also exhibited higher levels of academic achievement, aspiration (e.g., pursuing doctoral or other advanced degrees), and involvement (e.g., studying, talking with faculty) than nonparticipants. And when measuring development of life skills during college, student volunteers at LSAHE institutions displayed higher scores on thirteen different measures than nonparticipants, including perceptions of leadership abilities and opportunities, social self-confidence, interpersonal skills, understanding community problems, and knowledge and acceptance of other races and cultures.

In summary, LSAHE largely achieved its goals in its first year of operation. Community organizations were strongly positive about the contributions of student volunteers. Institutional support for service learning, although uneven, appears to be increasing. Further, students who participate in service show stronger gains than nonparticipants in academic achievement, life skills, and civic responsibility.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, we extend our thanks to the hundreds of Learn and Serve America, Higher Education program directors who completed questionnaires, identified their community partners, and responded to ad hoc requests for information. Thanks are due as well to the many community organization staff who took the time to complete our questionnaire.

We especially appreciate the many additional hours that a smaller number of program directors spent preparing for and hosting our site visits. Special acknowledgment is also extended to the members of our Evaluation Advisory Panel who took the time to review and comment on early drafts of our survey instruments and evaluation plan.

A number of RAND staff made valuable contributions to the first year evaluation. Charles A. Goldman assisted in survey design and analysis. Julie Carson stepped in when we needed help with data management. Sara Robyn's efforts following up with grantees boosted response rates. Frances Wang's timely and careful statistical analyses were greatly appreciated.

Finally, we appreciate the thoughtful feedback provided by CNS evaluation and program staff on earlier drafts of this report. Comments from Hugh Bailey, Chuck Helfer, and Lance Potter were especially helpful.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents results about the effects of Learn and Serve America, Higher Education (LSAHE) on communities, educational institutions, and students during its first year of operation.

A. BACKGROUND

The National and Community Service Trust Act, signed into law on September 21, 1993, established the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNS) to operate three separate initiatives: Learn and Service America, AmeriCorps, and the National Senior Service Corps. Each of these initiatives in turn encompasses a number of different programs. Learn and Serve America comprises two programs: one for elementary and secondary school students; and one for undergraduate and graduate students, which is the focus of this report. LSAHE has its origins in the Commission for National and Community Service, established in 1990, but has been modified to fit the structure and mission of the Corporation.

LSAHE emphasizes the links between service and academic learning by encouraging undergraduate and graduate students to serve as unpaid volunteers in community settings. CNS has identified three goals for LSAHE:

- (1) to engage students in meeting the unmet educational, public safety, human, and environmental needs of communities;
- (2) to enhance students' academic learning, their sense of social responsibility, and their civic skills through service-learning; and
- (3) to increase the number, quality, and sustainability of opportunities for students to serve by strengthening infrastructure and building capacity within and across the nation's institutions of higher education (LSAHE Application Materials, 1994).

CNS works toward these goals by awarding funds through a national competition to higher education institutions and community-based organizations. In fiscal year 1995, CNS distributed approximately \$9.5 million to 116 *direct grantees* under the LSAHE program. The LSAHE grantees are highly diverse with regard to geographic location, institutional characteristics, and community service program characteristics. Programs focus on any or all of the four priority areas of service established by CNS: education, human needs, public safety, and environment.

There are three types of direct grantees:

- (1) A *consortium* is a collection of institutions linked to a central hub that distributes part of the CNS award to other colleges and universities through a grant competition. Funds awarded in this manner are called *subgrants*. Some subgrantees then award *subsubgrants* to other colleges and universities. In fiscal 1994-95, CNS awarded grants to 26 consortia, who in turn awarded close to 400 subgrants or subsubgrants.
- (2) *Partnerships* refer to collaborative programming efforts among colleges and universities. In contrast to consortia, partnerships do not award subgrants.
- (3) *Single institution* grants are awarded to one organization (almost always a college or university but occasionally a community agency). This was the modal funding strategy in 1994-1995.

Reflecting the emphasis placed on student learning and development, LSAHE distinguishes between *community service* and *service-learning*. The authorizing legislation for LSAHE defines service-learning as a method:

- (A) Under which students or participants learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service that --
 - (i) is conducted in and meets the needs of a community;
 - (ii) is coordinated with an elementary school, secondary schools, institutions of higher education, or community service programs, and with the community; and
 - (iii) helps foster civic responsibility; and
- (B) that --
 - (i) is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students, or the educational components of the community service program in which the participants are enrolled; and
 - (ii) provides structured time for the students or participants to reflect on the service experience. (US Code Title 42, Section 12511, 1993).

An important distinguishing characteristic of service-learning is its emphasis on the development of the service provider. More specifically:

One of the characteristics of service-learning that distinguishes it from volunteerism is its balance between the act of community service by participants and reflection on that act, in order both to provide better service and to enhance the participants' own learning... Service-learning therefore combines a strong social purpose with acknowledgment of the significance of personal and intellectual growth in participants (Giles, Honne, & Migliore, 1991, p. 7).

B. NATIONAL EVALUATION OF LSAHE

CNS has focused its evaluation of LSAHE on five questions:

- (1) What work was performed by LSAHE programs?
- (2) What is the impact of the work performed by LSAHE programs on service recipients?
- (3) What are the institutional impacts of LSAHE, including effects on: (a) the level of support for service-learning within higher education institutions, and (b) relations between higher education institutions and community-based organizations?
- (4) What are the impacts of participation in LSAHE on students': (a) civic responsibility, (b) educational attainment, and (c) life skills?
- (5) What is the return on the LSAHE investment?

CNS contracted with RAND to address these questions in a national evaluation of the first three years of the LSAHE initiative. RAND then established a subcontract with the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) to help evaluate LSAHE impacts on student volunteers.

The evaluation plan includes both quantitative and qualitative methods. Although the evaluation's highest priority is to address the five impact questions, it also yields information about implementation of LSAHE and best practices in postsecondary service-learning. Over a three-year time period (1995-1997), data collection strategies are:

- (1) An "Annual Accomplishments Survey" of program directors to obtain descriptive information about grantee activities;
- (2) An annual "Community Impact Survey" of staff from community organizations linked with LSAHE to obtain community perceptions of LSAHE effectiveness;
- (3) A longitudinal survey of students enrolled in institutions receiving LSAHE grants enabling the evaluators to compare civic responsibility, educational attainment, and life skills development of participants and nonparticipants in community service;
- (4) A longitudinal survey of faculty within institutions receiving LSAHE grants enabling the evaluators to track changes in faculty support for and involvement in service-learning; and
- (5) A series of 30 institutional site visits (10 per year), to study implementation and effects of LSAHE within a diverse cross-section of grantees.

Table 1.1 shows how these data collection strategies address the five evaluation questions.

Table 1.1
Relationship Between Data Collection Activities
And the LSAHE Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Questions	Accomplishments Survey ¹	Community Impact Survey ¹	Follow-up Student Survey ²	Faculty Survey ³	Site Visits ¹
What work was performed by LSAHE programs?	X				X
What was the impact on service recipients?		X			X
What was the impact on institutions?	X	X		X	X
What were the impacts on service providers?			X		X
What were returns on the LSAHE investment?	X	X			X

1 Administered in Years 1, 2, and 3

2 Administered in Year 1, with another follow-up planned for Year 3

3 To be administered in Year 2

C. DATA COLLECTION IN 1994-95

During the first year, RAND and UCLA implemented four of the five data collection strategies:

- (1) Administration of the Annual Accomplishments Survey to LSAHE direct grantees, subgrantees, and subsubgrantees. 341 program directors returned the survey, for a 78 percent response rate;
- (2) Administration of the Community Impact Survey to a random sample of community organizations involved in LSAHE. 443 organizations returned the survey, for a 69 percent response rate;
- (3) Administration of a follow-up survey of students enrolled in schools with LSAHE grants to compare participants and nonparticipants in service-learning. Over 3,000 students returned the UCLA Follow-up Survey; and
- (4) A series of 10 site visits to grantees to explore LSAHE impacts on institutions and assess implementation of LSAHE across diverse sites.

As shown in Table 1.1, these methods provide preliminary responses to four of the five evaluation questions, with the exception being returns on investment. This analysis will be conducted in later stages of the evaluation as more cost data become available.

D. ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

This document is divided into six chapters. This chapter has described the goals, methods, and context of the national evaluation.

Chapter 2 addresses the question, "What work was performed by LSAHE programs?" Findings are based on the Annual Accomplishments Survey and site visits. The chapter describes the activities and accomplishments of LSAHE grantees and subgrantees over the past year.

Chapter 3 responds to the question, "What were the effects of LSAHE on service recipients?" Findings are based on the Community Impact Survey and site visits. We describe the community organizations through which students provided volunteer services and present results about the perceived quality and contributions of college student volunteers.

Chapter 4 addresses the question, “What were the institutional impacts of LSAHE?” Using information collected from surveys and site visits, this chapter describes the types of support LSAHE colleges and universities provide for service-learning and the ways in which schools and community organizations work together.

Chapter 5 examines the question, “What are the impacts of participation in LSAHE on students?” Findings are based on the UCLA HERI follow-up survey of over 3,000 students. This chapter discusses three general areas of student development: civic responsibility, academic development, and life skills. In addition, the chapter provides descriptive information on types of service, settings in which the service was performed and students’ reasons for participating in service.

Chapter 6 provides a summary and discussion of the findings of the analysis.

Volume II of this report includes technical appendices. These appendices describe the various data collection methods RAND and UCLA employed, provide supplemental information about the Annual Accomplishments Survey, Community Impact Survey, student survey, and site visits and present copies of the survey instruments.

2. WHAT WORK WAS PERFORMED BY LSAHE PROGRAMS?

A key component of the LSAHE evaluation is an Annual Accomplishments Survey that is administered yearly to program directors to address the question: "What work was performed by our programs?" This chapter reviews findings from the spring, 1995 Accomplishments Survey, covering program activities between September, 1994 and May, 1995.

RAND developed the Annual Accomplishments Survey to correspond with other CNS-sponsored evaluations while also responding to the unique aspects of LSAHE. The survey instrument contains questions about two broad categories of program activities: (1) those intended to build institutional capacity for service; and (2) those intended to serve the unmet needs of communities. The latter includes both descriptive information about service activities and quantitative data on specific service accomplishments (e.g., numbers of children tutored or recycling programs established) in eight service areas.

Three hundred and forty one (341) direct grantees, subgrantees, and subsubgrantees returned the questionnaire, for a 78 percent response rate.² Appendix A in the companion volume to this document describes the Accomplishments Survey methodology in more detail and displays the survey questionnaire. Appendix B provides supplemental results to those reported in this chapter.

The results that follow are divided into four sections. Section A provides descriptive information about respondents, including institutional and program characteristics and how LSAHE staff used their time. Section B describes accomplishments related to building institutional capacity for service. Section C describes accomplishments related to direct service, including specific accomplishments in eight service areas. Section D summarizes the major LSAHE accomplishments.

A. DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDING LSAHE PROGRAMS

CNS awarded 116 direct grants. Of this total, 26 were consortia which dispersed funds on a competitive basis to over 300 subgrantees, 16 of which further dispersed funds to over 70 subsubgrantees.

² More specifically, 96 percent of direct grantees, 73 percent of subgrantees, and 69 percent of subsubgrantees returned the survey.

Table 2.1 profiles the 341 programs responding to the survey. The highest proportion of LSAHE grants, subgrants, and subsubgrants were awarded to colleges and universities in the Eastern U.S. (New England and Middle Atlantic States), and the smallest proportion were awarded to institutions in the South. Almost half the grantees were located in urban areas. More than one-third of LSAHE grants, subgrants or subsubgrants were awarded to comprehensive universities compared to only 17 percent awarded to liberal arts colleges. Over two-thirds of the programs were funded through subgrants. Over half the direct grantees (55 percent) received LSAHE funding for the first time in the 1995 fiscal year. (Information on grant year for subgrantees is unavailable, although most subgrants were awarded for only one year.)

Direct grant awards ranged from \$12,000 to \$361,410 with a median of \$72,464. Roughly one-third of direct grantees received grants of \$45,000 or less, another third received grants between \$45,001 and \$90,000, and another third received grants over \$90,000. Consortia received substantially more funding than other direct grantees. Less than 10 percent received \$45,000 or less, over forty percent received between \$45,000 and \$90,000, and half the consortia received over \$90,000. Although there is a high volume of missing information about grant size for subgrantees and subsubgrantees, a review of available information indicates that these grants were much smaller on average than direct grants, generally under \$5,000.³

³ A review of information submitted to CNS by 90 subgrantees and subsubgrantees reveals a median award size of \$2,100. In response to the Accomplishments Survey, consortium directors reported a mean subgrant size of \$6,156, but this does not include subsubgrants and also is skewed by a small number of relatively large subgrants.

Table 2. 1
Profile of LSAHE Program Responding to the
Annual Accomplishments Survey*

Stratification Variables	Percent of Grantees
Location (N=339)	
West	24
Central	23
South	19
East	34
Urbanicity (N=218)	
Rural area	27
Suburban area	14
Urban area	40
Mixed	18
Institution Type (N=315)	
Research (PhD)	22
Comprehensive (MA)	37
Liberal arts (BA)	17
Community college (AA)	21
Other**	4
Type of Grant (N=341)	
Direct Grantees	32
Subgrantees (including Subsubgrantees)	68

*Column sums in this and subsequent tables may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

**“Other” includes community-based organizations, some consortia, and schools outside of the classifications used here.

To gain insight into program priorities and activities, the survey asked how program staff divided their time among eleven activities related to community service and service-learning. As shown in Table 2.2, staff devoted a great deal of their time to activities that build capacity for community service or service-learning as opposed to coordinating or supervising direct service activities. On average, 33 percent of staff time was devoted to

direct service activities and 54 percent to capacity building activities. The remaining 12 percent was spent on administrative activities, such as filling out forms and office support, or activities other than those listed.

Table 2.2
Percentage of Staff Time Spent on Various Activities

Activity	Mean Percent of Staff Time (N=341)
Direct Service	33
Supervise students providing community service	20
Organize community service activities	13
Capacity Building	49
Add service-learning to courses	13
Develop partnerships or networks	11
Provide technical assistance	8
Create publications	7
Raise funds for programs	4
Administer subgrants to other institutions	3
Establish centers or clearinghouses	3
Other	18
Conduct administrative work	13
Conduct research and evaluations	5
Total of all Staff Time	100

B. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN CAPACITY BUILDING

LSAHE grants were used for many different activities, some of which involved direct volunteering by students and others that provided service-learning opportunities or developed institutional capacity for additional community service. All of the programs responding to the Accomplishments Survey engaged in some form of capacity building in 1994-95. Most (78 percent) also involved students in direct service. This section presents program accomplishments related to capacity building. Table 2.3 displays the proportion of programs undertaking different types of capacity building activities.

Table 2.3
Percentage of Programs Including Various
Capacity Building Components

Program Component	Percent of Programs (N=341)
Service-learning courses	70
Technical assistance	69
Publications	50
Clearinghouses, databases	38
Subgrants	12

NOTE: Percentages sum to over 100 percent because most grantees conducted multiple capacity building activities.

Creating Service-learning Courses

More than two-thirds of all programs responding to the survey (70 percent) developed or modified service-learning courses. In total, 1,035 courses were developed or modified. On average, programs developed or modified three courses serving a median of 55 students and providing 90 classroom hours of instruction. As shown in Table 2.4, programs were most likely to offer service-learning in education courses, followed by sociology and the hard sciences.

Institutions with LSAHE grants also made strides toward sustaining these courses. Of the 240 programs that developed service-learning courses, 83 percent reported that all their newly developed courses would be offered the following year, and 8 percent reported that some of their courses would be offered the following year. Only 2 percent did not plan to offer the courses again. The remainder were unsure.

Table 2.4
Percentage of Programs with Service Learning Courses by Discipline

Discipline	Percent of Programs (N=240)
Education	30
Sociology	23
Hard sciences	19
Psychology	18
Business	17
English	16
Political science	10
Humanities	9
Health	9
Fine arts	8
Law	6
Social work	5
Communication	4
Languages	4
Other/unknown	20

NOTE: Percentages sum to over 100 percent because most grantees developed courses in more than one discipline.

Providing Training and Technical Assistance

Sixty-nine (69) percent of all LSAHE programs responding to the Accomplishments Survey provided training or technical assistance. The most popular topics for technical assistance were integrating service-learning into curricula and courses, supervising students involved in community service, linking higher education institutions and community organizations, and designing community service programs. Programs providing technical assistance were most likely to serve college students, faculty, and administrators. About one-third of the programs offering technical assistance served elementary or secondary school educators, and fewer than one-quarter served local citizens. On average, these programs provided 74 hours of technical assistance during the grant year and assisted 49 individuals.

Establishing Clearinghouses, Databases, and Other Information Resources

Of the 341 programs returning questionnaires, 38 percent established clearinghouses, databases or other information resources for developing and coordinating community service and service-learning activities. College students, faculty, and administrators were the most widespread users of these information resources.

Awarding Subgrants

Sample preparation for the Accomplishments Survey identified 328 subgrants and 72 subsubgrants originating with 26 consortia grantees. Survey results indicate that each consortium awarded between 2 and 56 subgrants. The median number of subgrants per consortium was 14. Median dollars subgranted per consortium was \$51,000.⁴

C. LSAHE PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN DIRECT SERVICE

About four out of five LSAHE programs provided community service opportunities for students. In other words, one in five responding grantees had no direct service component. The accomplishments of those providing direct service can be measured in several ways: numbers of service providers, service hours, and service recipients; and the community needs specific service activities addressed.

⁴ These responses suggest that the average subgrant size is \$6,156. However, these data do not take into account the fact that some subgrants were further divided to award subsubgrants. An independent review of information submitted to CNS by 90 subgrantees revealed an average subgrant size of \$2,100.

Numbers of Service Providers, Hours, and Recipients

The reported number of students participating in LSAHE ranged from 1 to 1,200 per program, with a median of 50. Respondents reported an average of nearly 35 hours of community service per student during the course of the program. Additionally, through their volunteer efforts, LSAHE programs served a median of 200 individuals across all the sites in which students served. Caution must be exercised in reporting and using these numbers, however. We found that programs used diverse and often ad hoc criteria for defining a LSAHE participant and for counting service recipients.⁵

In fact, the expectation that LSAHE participants could be identified and differentiated from other service participants within the same institution was not borne out. Instead, grantees typically combined LSAHE grants with other funds for service-learning and seeded an array of initiatives campuswide. As a result, reported numbers of service participants and their accomplishments cannot be consistently and fully attributed to LSAHE.

Community Needs Addressed

More than three-quarters of grantees worked in one or more of the priority areas of community need defined by CNS (see Table 2.5). Only 12 percent of the programs' activities did not fall within these eight areas. In addition, two-thirds (68 percent) of programs worked in multiple service areas.

⁵ Some, for example, counted all students associated with programs receiving LSAHE support, even if that support was just a small fraction of overall program costs. Others used more conservative criteria, attempting to count only those students directly supported with LSAHE dollars. Moreover, the distribution of reported participants is highly skewed, underscoring the need for caution when using these data. Similar problems emerge for service recipients. For example, a program that placed student volunteers in after-school centers might count everyone in attendance as service recipients, while another program offering the same service might count only those children that had direct contact with the student volunteers. Second, if the same person received service from several different volunteers or during different sessions, some programs counted that person each time while others counted the person only once.

Table 2.5
Percentage of Programs Working in Eight Service Areas

Area of Community Need	Objectives of Direct Service Activities	Percent of Programs Involved in Area
Education: School Success	Improve the educational achievement of school-age youth and adults	75
Human Needs	Help homeless or impoverished, elderly and disabled people	53
Neighborhood Environment	Promote environmental improvements in neighborhoods	38
Education: School Readiness & Literacy	Further early childhood development and adult literacy	37
Health	Provide comprehensive community health care and prevention services	37
Crime Prevention	Reduce the incidence of violence in schools and communities	31
Natural Environment	Conserve, restore, and sustain natural habitats.	24
Crime Control & Response	Improve criminal justice, law enforcement, and victim services	18
Other		12

Base = The 265 respondents providing direct service.

NOTE: Percentages sum to over 100 percent because most grantees worked in multiple areas.

As shown in Table 2.5, the majority of programs involved students in service in education, either in activities to improve school success (75 percent) or to enhance school readiness and adult literacy (37 percent). Relatively few programs (18 percent) placed students in service activities to control crime or aid law enforcement efforts to respond to crime.

Specific Accomplishments

This section describes LSAHE grantees' reported accomplishments in eight areas of community need.

School Readiness

Programs working in the area of school readiness and adult literacy devoted the most time to reading, tutoring, and teaching children at preschools, child care facilities, or in their homes. They also spent a significant portion of their time organizing recreational activities or providing childcare. The LSAHE programs that returned questionnaires reported that their students served 226 Head Start or other preschool facilities and 1,960 families.

School Success

Programs that sought to promote school success by improving the educational achievement of school-age youth and adults tended to spend most of their time providing out-of-class tutoring and mentoring. In total, the respondents involved in school success served 928 elementary schools, 358 middle schools or junior high schools, 254 high schools and 1,877 teachers.

Health

Programs working in this area devoted the most time to health education, independent living assistance, and health services and assessments. In total, the LSAHE respondents involved in health care made 735 home visits, served 218 clinics and hospitals, and recruited 196 additional community service providers into health care programs.

Human Needs

Meeting human needs by helping homeless, impoverished, elderly and/or disabled individuals is a fourth area of community need which LSAHE programs served. Respondents devoted the bulk of their time to offering companionship or chore support to elderly, ill, or disabled people and serving meals to homeless or low income individuals. These programs served 487 shelters or soup kitchens, organized 196 food or clothing drives, placed 67 homeless families in residence, helped 208 individuals transition from public assistance to self-sufficiency, and recruited 255 new service providers to this area.

Crime Prevention

LSAHE programs that sought to reduce the incidence of violence in schools and communities devoted the most time to teaching conflict resolution and providing gang diversion services, such as after-school or weekend programs for at-risk youth. Respondents taught 180 conflict mediation courses and were responsible for mediating 266 disputes. In total, these programs worked in 182 different communities to help prevent crime.

Crime Control

Relatively few LSAHE programs undertook service activities in the sixth area of crime control and response. However, those that did focused mostly on assisting victims of domestic violence or child abuse and neglect. Programs in this area also devoted a significant portion of time to counseling offenders or delinquents and assisting the police with crime control and response. In total, these LSAHE programs worked with 72 different victim assistance facilities and 54 police departments.

Neighborhood Environment

The LSAHE programs that organized direct service activities to promote environmental improvements in neighborhoods devoted the most time to clean-ups, tree plantings and other park and neighborhood revitalization efforts. Almost as much time was devoted to repairing and renovating homes or other structures. In total, respondents involved in improving neighborhood environments tested 205 buildings for environmental hazards, weatherized or repaired 119 homes, and improved 107 parks, gardens and other recreation areas.

Natural Environment

Most of the time spent in the area of natural environment was devoted to educating people, preserving public lands, and trail maintenance. Another significant accomplishment by programs in this area was recruiting additional people to community service work for the natural environment. In total, the LSAHE programs responding to the survey educated 4,839 people about the natural environment and served 215 public areas such as beaches and state parks. These programs improved 101 miles of trails, both maintaining existing trails and constructing new ones.

D. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Grantees are Highly Diverse

Grantees represented all segments of the higher education sector, ranging from elite research universities to community colleges. The largest percentage (40 percent) were in urban areas. LSAHE grants varied in size. Direct grants ranged from \$13,000 to \$361,410, with an average size of \$72,464. Subgrants and subsubgrants were much smaller, generally under \$5,000. Most grantees were in their first year of funding.

Subgranting Greatly Extended the “Reach” of LSAHE

Slightly more than one-fifth of all direct grantees competitively awarded subgrants to other colleges and universities. RAND identified 328 subgrantees, 16 of which awarded over 70 subsubgrants. Thus, the initial set of 116 CNS awards eventually encompassed almost 500 higher education institutions or roughly one in every seven colleges and universities nationwide. Subgrants were much smaller than direct grants, however, with most well under \$10,000.

LSAHE Program Staff Spent Most of their Time on Capacity Building Activities

In implementing LSAHE programs, staff spent more time on capacity building activities than on direct services. They devoted only one-third of their time to training, supervising, or coordinating student volunteers. The rest was spent on building institutional capacity for service, primarily adding service-learning to courses and curricula, developing partnerships or networks regarding community service, and program administration.

Integrating Service-learning into Curricula was the Single Most Common Capacity Building Activity

Almost three-quarters of LSAHE grantees integrated service-learning into courses and curricula, developing over 1,000 courses. On average, 55 students per program enrolled in these courses in 1994-95. The vast majority of these courses will be offered in 1995-96. Although courses spanned a wide range of disciplines, LSAHE institutions were more likely to have service-learning courses in education than in any other field.

Two-thirds of Respondents Also Provided Technical Assistance

On average, programs provided 74 hours of technical assistance, generally to college faculty, administrators, and students. The most popular topics for technical assistance were integrating service-learning into curricula, supervising students involved in community service, and linking higher education institutions and community organizations.

Most Programs Engaged in Direct Service to Communities and Individuals

More than three-quarters (78 percent) of respondents included some direct service in their LSAHE program. On average, LSAHE programs involved 50 student volunteers and provided 960 hours of volunteer work benefiting 200 service recipients. However, variations across and within programs in determining numbers of participants and numbers of service recipients render these findings suggestive only.

Direct Services Spanned All Eight CNS Priority Areas of Service

On average, programs worked in three different areas. Across all eight areas studied, grantees provided over 60 different types of service.

3. WHAT WERE LSAHE IMPACTS ON COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND SERVICE RECIPIENTS?

In addition to describing LSAHE program activities, the evaluation also assesses the effectiveness of service activities in strengthening the service sector and meeting community needs. This chapter discusses the perceived impacts of student volunteers on community organizations and direct recipients of service.

A. APPROACH TO THE EVALUATION OF IMPACTS ON SERVICE RECIPIENTS

The perceptions of community organization staff are especially important in evaluating LSAHE impacts on communities because these staff regularly observe the work of student volunteers. Moreover, their assessments are important to the long-term success of collegiate service programs, which require cooperation from community organizations.

RAND therefore surveyed a random sample of community organizations that served as host sites for student volunteers from LSAHE institutions. Survey questions focused on:

- Descriptive information about the community organizations involved in LSAHE; and
- Community organization assessments of the student volunteers from a designated “partner” LSAHE college or university, including the students’: (a) effects on the organization; (b) effects on service recipients; and (c) strengths and weaknesses as service providers.

Over two thirds (69 percent) of those receiving a survey returned it, for a total sample size of 443 community organizations.⁶ Appendix C describes the survey methodology in more detail. This chapter provides aggregate findings for all respondents. Appendix D provides supplemental results, including comparisons among various subgroups of respondents.

Site visits also contributed to the evaluation of LSAHE impacts on service recipients. Appendix E describes the site visit methodology. Of particular relevance are 39 in-person interviews with staff from community organizations involved in LSAHE. In addition, we observed students performing volunteer work in 18 community organizations.

⁶ However, only 434 responses were available for analysis.

Caveats

Our preliminary research revealed that most community organization staff did not differentiate student volunteers involved in LSAHE programs from those involved in other service programs at the same college or university. Thus, respondents were asked to assess the contributions of *all* student volunteers attending their designated partner college or university.

These results are based on respondent perceptions. However, several factors speak to the validity of the findings. The high response rate to the survey (69 percent) reduced response bias. We also found a high level of agreement among multiple methods (survey results, site visit interviews, and direct observation); this triangulation increases our confidence in the results.

Organization of the Chapter

The next section (Section B) describes the organizations with which LSAHE programs worked. Section C describes LSAHE effects on the community organizations, and Section D describes effects on the direct recipients of service. Section E discusses the strengths and weaknesses of student volunteers. The final section of this chapter summarizes the major findings.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

This section describes the community organizations that responded to the Community Impact Survey. Appendix D provides additional information about the respondents.

Characteristics of Community Organizations in the Sample

Half (49 percent) the respondents to the survey were in private, nonprofit organizations. Thirty-one (31) percent were part of a school district, while others were government agencies (12 percent), for-profit organizations (2 percent), and unspecified (7 percent). Consistent with the Accomplishments Survey results, community organization respondents were most likely to work in the area of school success and least likely to work in the area of public safety. Service areas included large cities with over 500,000 residents (served by 29 percent of respondents), mid-size cities (served by 29 percent) and small towns or rural areas (served by 41 percent).

Most of the community organizations responding to the survey were small, with about half employing ten or fewer staff. Less than 15 percent employed over 100 staff. These larger respondents were primarily school districts. The community organizations served a median of 235 and a mean of 1,412 individuals per month.⁷

Student Volunteer Activities Within Community Organizations⁸

Community organizations responding to the survey reported that, on average, 10 students from their partner LSAHE institution provided volunteer services in 1994-95. These students represented about 20 percent of the total number of volunteers working in the community organization. Only 2 percent of responding organizations relied exclusively on the LSAHE students for volunteer support. As a group, the student volunteers provided a median of 64 hours of service per month (or slightly more than six hours per month per student) and served about 30 clients per month.⁹ Table 3.1 displays these findings.

Table 3.1
Average Service Hours and Number of People Served
by Student Volunteers from LSAHE Institutions

Service Measures	Mean	Median
Hours per month of service	165	64
Total service hours (9/94 - 4/95)	889	300
Number of Service Recipients	394	30

N = 434

Although student volunteers from LSAHE institutions assisted a variety of people, the typical service recipient was an impoverished youth. On average, 80 percent of the service

⁷ The service recipient numbers refer to all those served by the organization, not just those served by student volunteers. Caution is needed in interpreting these numbers because programs differed in the criteria used to count "service recipients." Also, the difference between the mean and median indicates that the distribution is highly skewed.

⁸ Here and throughout the chapter, "student volunteers" refers to students attending LSAHE institutions.

⁹ As reported in Chapter 2, Accomplishments Survey results indicate that students in LSAHE-supported programs served a median of 200 service recipients, much higher than the number reported here. This higher number, however, refers to the *total* number of service recipients served by a LSAHE programs, based on the entire 1994-95 academic year and all the community organizations in which students served.

recipients assisted by the student volunteers had family incomes at or below the federally defined poverty level (defined as a family of four with a total income less than \$10,563). Almost half (49 percent) were between the ages of 6 and 16.

C. IMPACTS OF STUDENT VOLUNTEERS ON COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

To determine if student volunteers from LSAHE institutions enhanced the community organizations in which they served, seven survey questions asked respondents to evaluate how the college student volunteers affected their organization's activities or services. Ratings were provided on five-point scales, where 1 means that the volunteers' efforts led to a strong decrease or decline on the dimension, 2 means that the volunteers' efforts led to some decrease or decline, 3 means that the volunteers' efforts had no effect, 4 means that the volunteers' efforts led to some improvements or increases, and 5 means that the volunteers' efforts led to strong improvements or increases.

As indicated in Table 3.2, responses reveal that student volunteers from LSAHE institutions made substantial contributions to the quality, volume, and variety of services provided. Moreover, since these volunteers increased the total number of volunteers serving community organizations, it appears that they supplemented rather than replaced pre-existing volunteer support.

Put somewhat differently, well over half the respondents to the Community Impact Survey believed that the college student volunteers enabled their organization to strengthen its operations and services. For example, 71 percent responded that college student volunteers helped the organization improve the quality of service, 59 percent responded that college student volunteers helped the organization increase the variety of services, and 52 percent responded that college student volunteers helped the organization serve more people.

Table 3.2
Mean Ratings of How Student Volunteers Affected
Community Organizations' Activities and Services

Variable	Mean* (range = 1-5)
Quality of service	4.2
Amount of service per recipient	3.9
Variety of services	3.9
Number of volunteers in organization	3.9
Number of service recipients	3.8
Number of paid staff	3.1
Workload of paid staff	3.0

* Higher scores indicate positive impacts
 N = 434

Although Table 3.2 indicates that student volunteers had no effects on staff workload, respondents did report spending a median of three hours per week and a mean of seven hours per week supervising the volunteers. The time spent on supervision, however, was apparently offset by the contributions of the volunteers.

Another set of ratings assessed volunteers' effectiveness in serving the goals and interests of community organizations. Ratings were made on five-point scales, where 1 = "not effective" and 5 = "highly effective." As shown in Table 3.3, student volunteers from LSAHE institutions were perceived as highly effective in helping the organizations achieve their goals, except in the areas of obtaining needed resources and providing technical assistance, where their efforts appeared to have relatively small effects.¹⁰

¹⁰ Although over two thirds of LSAHE grantees engaged in some technical assistance, most of this assistance was provided to other higher education institutions rather than to community organizations.

Table 3.3
Mean Ratings of Student Volunteers’
Effectiveness in Serving Community Organizations

Variable	Mean* (range = 1-5)
Helping organization achieve its mission and goals	4.1
Improving relations with LSAHE college	4.0
Obtaining needed resources (e.g. funds, supplies)	3.4
Providing technical assistance or training	3.1

* Higher scores indicate higher effectiveness.

N = 434

D. IMPACTS OF STUDENT VOLUNTEERS ON DIRECT RECIPIENTS OF SERVICE

This section describes how community organizations evaluated the effectiveness of student volunteers from LSAHE institutions within four areas of service: (1) education (school readiness, school success, and literacy); (2) health, human needs, and homelessness; (3) public safety and legal services; and (4) neighborhood and natural environment. In all cases, students were rated on five-point scales ranging from 1 = “not effective” to 5 = “highly effective.” Tables 3.4 through 3.7 display the mean responses to items within each of these four sections. Sample sizes for this section vary because community organizations were asked to respond only if the item applied to the efforts of the student volunteers from their partner LSAHE institution.

In all cases, the students were considered very effective in providing service outputs. Mean scores ranged from a high of 4.5 for effectiveness in conserving, restoring, and sustaining natural habitats to a low of 3.4 for improving parents’ child care skills and strengthening law enforcement. In other words, all 27 items yielded ratings well above the midpoint of the scale. The responses also reflect the diversity of volunteer activities and responsibilities. Consistent with previously reported results, the largest number of student volunteers worked in education, and the smallest number worked in public safety.

Table 3.4
Mean Ratings by Community Organizations of Student Volunteers' Effectiveness
in Providing Educational Services

Volunteers' effectiveness in:	Mean* (Range = 1-5)	Number of Respondents
Improving students' school achievement	4.2	182
Promoting children's readiness for school	4.1	95
Improving adult literacy	3.8	54
Improving English skills of immigrants	3.8	53
Reducing drop-out rates	3.7	88
Improving adult job skills	3.6	49
Strengthening parents' child care skills	3.4	54
Overall Mean Score	3.9	203

* Higher scores indicate higher effectiveness.

Table 3.5
Mean Ratings by Community Organizations of Student Volunteers' Effectiveness
in Providing Health and Human Needs Services

Volunteers' effectiveness in:	Mean* (Range = 1-5)	Number of Respondents
Improving conditions for low-income or homeless	4.1	50
Meeting health care needs of service recipients	4.0	57
Improving service recipients' knowledge about health	4.0	57
Helping people live healthier lifestyles	4.0	56
Helping disabled and elderly people live independently	4.0	30
Reducing risk of AIDS or other diseases	3.7	35
Overall Mean Score	4.0	112

* Higher scores indicate higher effectiveness.

Table 3.6
Mean Ratings by Community Organizations of Student Volunteers' Effectiveness
in Providing Public Safety and Legal Services

Volunteers' effectiveness in:	Mean* (Range = 1-5)	Number of Respondents
Mediating disputes	4.0	11
Teaching conflict resolution skills	3.9	29
Preventing or reducing crime	3.8	28
Improving victim services	3.8	10
Providing legal services	3.5	13
Strengthening law enforcement	3.4	10
Overall Mean Score	3.8	54

* Higher scores indicate higher effectiveness.

Table 3.7
Mean Ratings by Community Organizations of Student Volunteers' Effectiveness
in Enhancing Natural or Neighborhood Environments

Volunteers' effectiveness in:	Mean* (Range = 1-5)	Number of Respondents
Conserving or restoring natural habitats	4.5	13
Building or renovating homes or other structures	4.1	7
Revitalizing neighborhoods and parks	4.1	25
Improving community knowledge about environmental safety	4.0	19
Increasing energy efficient behaviors	4.0	27
Improving community knowledge about the natural environment	3.9	22
Improving environmental safety	3.8	18
Strengthening community economic development	3.8	10
Overall Mean Score	4.0	57

* Higher scores indicate higher effectiveness.

Site visit observations provided additional insights into the ways in which student volunteers fulfilled the needs of service recipients. For example:

- Within the area of education, we observed college students tutoring low-achieving elementary school students in a Chapter I classroom. Assistance focused on math, reading, and computer skills. The teachers attributed measurable gains in children's test scores largely to the individual attention provided by volunteers.
- Within the area of health and human needs, we observed students conducting oral histories with members of a senior center in an inner city neighborhood. The coordinator of volunteer services observed that the opportunity for seniors to share their personal and cultural traditions had positive effects on their psychological well-being. In another site, medical students conducted a community health needs assessment, which provided the foundation for health planning.
- Within the area of public safety, we observed students visiting young men in a residential facility for juvenile offenders. Center staff noted that the students modeled appropriate social behavior, encouraged the residents to continue their education, and reassured them that society had not forgotten them.
- Within the area of environment, we observed students working with an urban after-school program to determine the lead content in soil on the elementary school grounds. Student volunteers discussed the health hazards of lead exposure and worked with students to collect samples with teaspoons and jars. Samples were brought back to the LSAHE institution for analysis. By raising children's awareness of environmental hazards, the volunteers were helping to prevent lead poisoning in children and their siblings; additionally, the test results could spur interventions to reduce lead content of the soil.

E. COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION ASSESSMENTS OF STUDENT VOLUNTEERS

The results presented to this point indicate strong positive assessments of student volunteers' contributions to both community organizations and direct recipients of service. What skills and abilities do students bring to their volunteer work, and where is there room for improvement? Additionally, are volunteers from LSAHE institutions more or less effective than other service providers? This section addresses these questions.

Assessments of Student Volunteers' Skills and Attitudes

Respondents evaluated the student volunteers from LSAHE institutions on seven characteristics. Scores ranged from 1 = "poor" to 5 = "excellent." Again the scores were

highly positive, as can be seen in Table 3.8. On each dimension, students were rated as strong or excellent. Mean scores ranged from a high of 4.5 for enthusiasm to a low of 4.1 for skills in the area of service provided.

Table 3.8
Mean Ratings of Student Volunteer Characteristics

Characteristic	Mean* (range = 1-5)
Enthusiasm	4.5
Ability to work well with staff	4.4
Ability to work well with clients	4.3
Communication or interpersonal skills	4.2
Ability to work independently	4.2
Reliability	4.2
Skills in the area of service provided	4.1

* Higher scores indicate higher effectiveness.

N = 434

Additional feedback about student volunteer strengths and weaknesses comes from written comments on the questionnaires. These data confirm that community organizations appreciated the enthusiasm of the student volunteers from LSAHE institutions. On the other hand, the respondents also offered some clues about where improvement in volunteers' performance was desirable. The most common complaint concerned scheduling, because academic schedules are not consistently synchronized with community organizations' needs. For example, K-12 and higher education calendars differ, so that volunteers were often unavailable for an entire K-12 semester. Additionally, students' day-to-day schedules were constrained by their courses and (in many cases) work responsibilities, so they could not necessarily provide services at the times most needed by community organizations. Some could provide less hours than desired, many volunteered for a relatively short time period (e.g., a 10 to 15-week quarter or semester), and all but the most committed tended to skip volunteering during exams and vacations. Transportation difficulties further constrained service schedules.

These problems created the greatest barriers for organizations that invested significant time in training volunteers, since the relatively short duration of service by students reduced the cost effectiveness of such training. Other respondents noted that scheduling difficulties and turnover increased the time staff needed to spend coordinating and orienting student volunteers. Furthermore, some respondents said that their service recipients already had long histories of broken relations; volunteers who stayed for just a short period of time, however well-intended, added to the clients' lack of trust in others.

For the most part, respondents reported good relations with their partner LSAHE institution. Fewer than 10 percent criticized the coordination or oversight provided by the LSAHE institution. Comments here mentioned the need for more training and follow-through, lack of guidance about how to utilize the students appropriately, and lack of communication between the community organization and the college or university.

Comparison to Other Service Providers

To place the strengths and weaknesses of the student volunteers from LSAHE institutions in context, respondents were asked to compare them to other volunteers and to paid service providers. Again, ratings were based on five-point scales, where 1 = "much worse than others," 3 = "about the same," and 5 = "much better than others." Table 3.9 indicates that, despite some concerns, community organization staff responding to the survey rated the student volunteers from LSAHE institutions as much better than other volunteers and about the same as paid staff.

Table 3.9
Mean Ratings of Benefits of Working with Student Volunteers from LSAHE Institutions Compared to Other Service Providers

Comparison	Mean* (range = 1-5)
Compared to other college student volunteers	3.9
Compared to non-student volunteers	3.8
Compared to your expectations	3.8
Compared to paid service providers	3.2

* Higher scores indicate student volunteers compare favorably
N = 434

In other words, 59 percent of respondents rated the college student volunteers as more effective than other (non-student) volunteers. About the same percentage (62 percent) rated the college student volunteers as exceeding the expectations of community agency staff when the program began.

Global Ratings of Student Volunteers from LSAHE Institutions

Finally, respondents were asked to provide three overall ratings of student volunteers. First, they were asked whether the benefits of working with the students outweighed the costs and problems of working with them. Given the overwhelmingly positive responses up to this point, it is not surprising that the vast majority of organizations felt the benefits outweighed the costs. In fact, 76 percent responded that the benefits “far” outweighed the costs, and 16 percent felt they “slightly” outweighed the costs. Another 6 percent of respondents felt the benefits equaled the costs/problems, and only 2 percent felt the costs either slightly or far outweighed the benefits of working with the students.

Second, respondents were asked if they would recommend that other agencies or organizations similar to theirs enlist student volunteers as service providers. On a scale of 1 = “definitely not” to 5 = “definitely would,” the mean response of the community organizations was 4.6. But perhaps the most telling result was in response to the question: If you had it to do over again, would you still use (college) student volunteers? An overwhelming 97 percent of respondents said “Yes,” the remaining 3 percent were unsure, and *none* said “No.”

F. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Community Organizations are Highly Diverse

The 434 community organizations participating in our survey were a diverse group encompassing a wide array of services and service recipients. Almost half were private, nonprofit enterprises, and one-third (31 percent) were part of a school district. The organizations were fairly evenly dispersed between large urban areas, mid-size urban areas, and small cities or rural areas. Services provided by the organizations tend to focus on school achievement and promoting or improving health while other services, such as those associated with legal or environmental needs, were more limited.

On average, 10 students from LSAHE institutions volunteered in each community organization, providing 64 hours of service and assisting 30 people. The service recipients were most often economically and educationally disadvantaged youth.

Student Volunteers from LSAHE Institutions Received Strong Positive Ratings

Respondents indicated that student volunteers from LSAHE institutions enabled the community organizations to improve the quality, variety, and quantity of services delivered. The students were also effective in meeting the needs of direct recipients of service within the service areas of education, health and human needs, public safety, and environment. Respondents would highly recommend the services of college students to other community organizations.

Student Volunteers from LSAHE Institutions Had Distinct Strengths and Weaknesses

Respondents praised the enthusiasm, motivation, and interpersonal skills of the student volunteers. The most widespread problems concerned schedules, as students tried to balance volunteer work with school, employment, and other responsibilities. Despite some concerns, however, the respondents felt that the benefits of working with college student volunteers far outweighed the costs.

Student Volunteers from LSAHE Institutions Were Comparable to Paid Staff

These students were rated as *more* effective than other volunteers and exceeded respondents' expectations for these students. They were rated slightly higher than paid service providers.

Discussion

The Community Impact Survey reveals that community organizations are very satisfied with the contributions of volunteers enrolled in institutions that receive LSAHE support. Even if we assumed that nonrespondents to the survey are more negative in their evaluations than respondents, the results would still provide a strong evaluation of the services provided by students in LSAHE institutions. Although many LSAHE programs assign a higher priority to promoting student growth and learning than to serving community needs, clearly community organization staff believe the latter is occurring. This bodes well for the future of service-learning, since community support is essential for the long-term success and stability of these programs.

Despite the positive responses, open-ended comments point to some problem areas that should be explored in Years 2 and 3 of the evaluation. These include scheduling, transportation, training, and communications between community organizations and LSAHE institutions.

Although we expected that future administration of the Community Impact Survey would enable us to track changes in community responses to student volunteers from LSAHE institutions, the high ratings obtained here leave little room to track improvements or increases in perceived effectiveness of the student volunteers. Future research should, however, document that the positive assessments obtained here endure over time and are not a short-term reaction.

4. WHAT WERE LSAHE IMPACTS ON INSTITUTIONS?

Considerable anecdotal evidence indicates that many campus-based service programs face internal obstacles, such as weak support from administrators and faculty and poor “town-gown” relations. Furthermore, if service is to be more than just a passing trend in higher education, institutions must develop ways to sustain programs and link them to their core functions. Thus, CNS assigned LSAHE grantees responsibility for building the service infrastructure on their campuses.

The evaluation was charged with assessing LSAHE effects on institutions, including both the internal changes that colleges and universities make to accommodate a service mission and relations between higher education institutions and community organizations. This chapter addresses both of these types of effects.

Because organizational change occurs slowly in higher education, we designed the evaluation to measure impacts across the full three-year course of LSAHE. In the first year, we focused on two tasks: (1) developing a conceptual framework to define the domain of “institutional impacts” relevant to LSAHE; and (2) collecting baseline data based on this framework. The site visits guided development of the conceptual framework, and the Annual Accomplishments and Community Impact surveys provided baseline data about institutional support for service and the impacts of LSAHE. Appendices A, C, and E describe the survey and site visit methods.

A. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING INSTITUTIONAL IMPACTS

Despite widespread agreement among grantees that colleges and universities should provide more support for service-learning, we found little agreement about either the *types* of institutional support that are most important or the *strategies* practitioners should implement to obtain support.

Challenges in Assessing Institutional Impacts

While there is broad agreement about the importance of building the service infrastructure, there is less agreement about how to proceed. For example, some grantees consider full-time staff essential to a strong service infrastructure, while others believe that service infrastructures will be strongest when dedicated staff are no longer needed because others

grantees fit in the framework. A framework offers a way to describe institutional support for service-learning in diverse settings. It provides baseline data against which to track change in institutional impacts. It also clarifies the choices practitioners face for strengthening the service infrastructure. Our conceptual framework divides the service infrastructure into four domains:

- *Organizational structure and resources*, including the resources institutions provide for service-learning programs and courses; placement of service programs in Academic vs. Student Affairs; and the reporting line(s) for service program directors.
- *Campus culture*, including expressions of institutional values related to service, traditions of service, and incentives and rewards for participation in service.
- *Curriculum*, including the extent and nature of service-learning courses.
- *Community relations*, including the extent and nature of campus-community collaboration, cooperation, and contact.

The first three domains are internal to colleges and universities, while the fourth domain refers to campus-community relations.

Our framework further suggests that campuses with dedicated resources and staff, a campus culture supportive of service, curriculum infusion, and strong community relations will manifest positive outcomes in three areas: (1) Quality of service programs; (2) Program sustainability; and (3) Centrality, or breadth of participation by students and faculty (see Table 4.1). Each of these hypotheses could be empirically tested in future research.

Table 4.1
How Institutional Support in Four Domains is Expected to
Promote Quality, Sustainability, and Centrality of Service-learning

Domains of Institutional Support	Outcomes		
	Quality	Sustainability	Centrality
Organizational Structure	Service “center” provides training, T/A, & quality control	Permanent budget, staff, & space ensure program continuity	Institution offers academic & co-curricular service opportunities
Campus Culture	Excellence in service is recognized and rewarded	Strong service traditions continue over time	Normative expectation that students will participate in service
Curriculum	Service is linked to academic programs; Peer review ensures rigor	Tenured faculty provide continuity; departments integrate service into core courses	A broad range of students are exposed to service-learning
Community Relations	Agencies & institutions understand & support one another’s goals & needs	Community organizations welcome student volunteers semester after semester	The community offers a range of opportunities for student involvement

B. BASELINE DATA ON LSAHE IMPACTS ON INSTITUTIONS

This section describes how LSAHE institutions support service programs and activities. These data offer insight into the higher education context and provide baseline measures for the evaluation.¹¹

How Colleges and Universities Support Service Programs

A majority of the institutions responding to the Accomplishments Survey provide support for service in all three internal (campus-based) domains in the conceptual framework:

¹¹ Because the conceptual framework presented in the previous section emerged from the site visits, our survey instruments were not informed or guided by this framework. Fortunately, however, we have some survey data for each domain.

organizational structure, campus culture, and curriculum. Results suggest, however, that the level of support is uneven both within and across institutions. The first column of Table 4.2 displays these findings.

Within the organizational domain, most schools in the sample had a volunteer center, although not necessarily with full-time staff support. Within the domain of campus culture, two-thirds of the responding institutions rewarded students and faculty for participation in service, but only 10 percent require service for graduation. Within the curriculum domain, almost all the schools integrated service into courses, although many fewer infused service into the core curriculum.

These data reflect the variety of institutional support for service-learning. They do not, however, tell us how LSAHE grants directly affect institutional support. Does receiving a LSAHE grant facilitate institutional support for service, or does institutional support increase the likelihood of obtaining a LSAHE grant?

To address this question, we asked Accomplishments Survey respondents to indicate whether their institutions offered various forms of support before or after the implementation of LSAHE. We also asked Community Impact Survey respondents to indicate how relations with their partner academic institution had changed since inception of the LSAHE grant. The former addresses the internal changes institutions made and the latter points to the external changes institutions made. Although we cannot credit LSAHE for *creating* the support offered since program inception, we can conclude that LSAHE is *associated* with certain types of institutional change.

Internal Changes. Of the 12 forms of institutional support studied, LSAHE shows the strongest association with curriculum support. If we look only at the institutional supports implemented since the inception of LSAHE (see the second column of Table 4.2), we find that almost one-third of the sample offered course development funds to faculty, sponsored faculty committees on service-learning, and added service-learning into courses *for the first time* in 1994-95. These results are consistent with other evaluation findings. The Accomplishments Survey, for example, indicates that responding institutions created over 1,000 new courses, providing further evidence of LSAHE impacts on curriculum.

Table 4.2
Percentage of LSAHE Institutions in Accomplishments Survey
Offering Support for Service-learning and
Percentage Implementing New Support *After* LSAHE

Type of Support	Percent With Support (N=341)	Percent Implementing Support After LSAHE Began (N=341)
Organizational Structure and Staffing		
House a service-learning center	75	23
Have full-time staff for service learning	46	16
Campus Culture		
Reward involvement in service	68	25
Include service in new student orientation	56	21
Mention service in mission statement	34	8
Note service on student transcripts	19	7
Require service to graduate	10	3
Curriculum		
Integrate service-learning into courses	92	33
Sponsor a faculty committee on service learning	53	30
Include service-learning in core curriculum	31	14
Indicate service-learning courses in catalog	40	21
Offer course development funds to faculty for service-learning courses	45	30

External Changes. The Community Impact Survey asked respondents to indicate how relations with their partner college or university had changed since inception of the LSAHE program. Table 4.3 displays responses.

Table 4.3
Percentage Change in Community Relations Activities
Since LSAHE Program Began*

Types of Activities	Percent		
	Decreased Since LSAHE	Stayed the Same	Increased Since LSAHE
Number of joint service projects with community organizations	4	50	46
Use of faculty or staff as consultants to community organizations	4	44	52
Use of community organization staff as instructors or consultants on campus	5	53	42
Participation on committees with both community and campus representation	4	49	47

* Number of respondents ranges from 260 to 297 per item. Respondents are staff from community organizations, not LSAHE grantees.

In its first year, LSAHE was associated with improving campus-community relations. Slightly under half the responding organizations reported increases in joint service projects, joint membership on committees, and involvement of community organization staff as instructors or consultants to the college. Just over half reported increased use of campus personnel as consultants to the community organizations. Again, we cannot conclude that LSAHE caused these increases, but we can place LSAHE in a context of generally improving campus-community relations.

C. CHAPTER SUMMARY

Colleges and universities with LSAHE grants support service through a variety of strategies. A majority of LSAHE institutions responding to the Accomplishments Survey housed community service centers, infused service into curriculum, and rewarded students or faculty for their involvement in service.

Preliminary findings suggest that LSAHE funding is associated with growing institutional support for service, including course development funds for faculty, establishment of faculty committees on service-learning, and continued development of service-learning courses. Additionally, community organizations report modest but positive increases in relations with higher education institutions following inception of LSAHE.

5. WHAT WERE LSAHE IMPACTS ON STUDENT VOLUNTEERS?¹²

This chapter summarizes how participation in service at colleges and universities affected student development in three outcome areas: civic responsibility, educational attainment, and life skills. Questions addressed in this chapter include:

- How did participation in service impact students' commitment to serving their communities and to helping others?
- How did participation in service affect students' belief that the individual can change society?
- How did service participation contribute to students' academic development as reflected in grades, persistence, degree aspirations, knowledge gained, and involvement in academic life?
- How did service participation impact the development of important life skills, such as leadership ability, interpersonal skills, critical thinking skills, and conflict resolution skills?
- How did service participation impact students' understanding of problems facing their local communities and the nation at large?
- Did the effects of service participation depend on the amount of time spent conducting service?
- Did the effects of course-based service differ from the effects of service provided through the co-curriculum or conducted independently?

This chapter addresses these and additional questions through an analysis of freshman and follow-up data collected from 3,450 students attending 42 LSAHE institutions (see Appendix F for a list of institutions). The chapter is organized into the following sections: (1) survey design and sample characteristics; (2) characteristics of service participants; (3) characteristics of service involvement at LSAHE institutions; (4) differences between service participants and nonparticipants in the three outcome areas of civic responsibility, academic development, and life skills; (5) change during college experienced by service participants and nonparticipants with respect to the three outcome areas; and (6) unique effects of service participation on student development in the three outcome areas.

A. SURVEY DESIGN AND SAMPLE

The strongest research design for determining whether service participation actually changes the participants encompasses both longitudinal and cross-sectional comparisons.

¹² This chapter was written by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA.

To measure change over time among participants, data must be collected at two or more time points—before and after students become involved in service at their college. Accordingly, data used in this study were collected through two national surveys—a freshman survey and a follow-up survey—conducted by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at UCLA. The “before” survey was administered to students when they first entered college as freshmen (between 1990 and 1994) and the “after” survey was administered to the same students in the Spring and Summer of 1995. These instruments can be found in Appendix F.

Furthermore, in order to know whether the observed changes in civic responsibility, academic attainment, and life skills are unique to those who participate in service, data should be collected from both participants and nonparticipants at the same institutions. Thus, the sample in this evaluation includes 3,450 students (2,309 service participants and 1,141 nonparticipants) attending 42 LSAHE institutions. Among the 2,309 service participants, 478 were specifically identified by LSAHE program directors. The remaining 1,831 service participants self-reported service participation on the follow-up survey. As reported in Appendix G, the service experiences of LSAHE-identified participants were quite similar to those of other students performing service at LSAHE institutions. Additional characteristics of the sample and institutions are provided in Appendix F.

B. WHO PARTICIPATED IN SERVICE?

Before examining the effects of service participation, it is important to know what types of students chose to participate in service during college. Participants and nonparticipants were compared on all student characteristics included in this study (see Appendix F for a list of these characteristics). Table 5.1 describes all significant differences between participants and nonparticipants. These differences indicate that service participants, as compared with nonparticipants, were more likely to have engaged in the following activities during high school: performing volunteer work, tutoring another student, attending religious services, participating in a community action program, and being a guest in a teacher’s home. Participants also had more confidence in their leadership abilities, were more likely to be women, and were less likely than nonparticipants to attend college in order to make more money. These differences tell us that service participants were different from nonparticipants when they came to college. Therefore, as described later in this chapter, it was necessary to examine the effects of service participation *after* controlling for these and other potential differences between service participants and nonparticipants.

Table 5.1
Key Pretest Differences Between Service Participants and Nonparticipants

Characteristic	Percent among		Difference
	Service participants (N=2,309)	Non-participants (N=1,141)	
Goal: Participate in a community action program ^a	44.0	18.4	+25.6
Performed volunteer work in high school ^b	88.1	69.4	+18.7
Tutored another student ^b	72.8	58.9	+13.9
Sex: Female	70.4	59.9	+10.5
Guest in a teacher's home ^b	33.9	23.7	+10.2
Reason for coming to college:			
Make more money ^d	59.0	67.2	-8.2
Self-rated leadership ability ^c	22.3	15.2	+7.1
Attended religious services ^b	89.8	83.4	+6.4

^a Percent rating goal as "very important" or "essential"

^b Percent reporting "frequently" or "occasionally"

^c Percent reporting "top 10%"

^d Percent reporting "very important"

C. CHARACTERISTICS OF SERVICE INVOLVEMENT

This section examines the characteristics of service involvement for the 2,309 students participating in service at the 42 LSAHE institutions.

As shown in Table 5.2, students were most likely to participate in service in the area of education, followed by the areas of human needs, environment, and public safety.

Table 5.2
Service Participation by Category of Service
(N=2,309)

Category of service	Percent
Education	73.1
Human needs	64.5
Environment	53.3
Public safety	22.1

Note: Percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6). Percentages add to more than 100 because many respondents marked more than one category.

The specific types of service conducted across the four broad categories are described in Table 5.3. The most popular service activity is tutoring or teaching, with a full 64 percent of service participants reporting involvement in this area. Students also reported substantial levels of involvement in activities related to the environment, specifically in the areas of conservation activities (39 percent) and community cleanup/rebuilding (34 percent). Other popular service activities include childcare (27 percent), personal counseling/mentoring (27 percent), homeless/shelter support (24 percent) and educational counseling/mentoring (24 percent).

Table 5.3
Service Participation by Type of Service Activity
(N=2,309)

Service activity	Percent	Category of service
Tutoring/teaching	63.9	Education
Conservation activities	38.8	Environment
Community cleanup/rebuilding	34.1	Environment
Childcare	27.2	Human Needs
Personal counseling/mentoring	27.1	Human Needs
Homeless/shelter support	24.1	Human Needs
Educational counseling/mentoring	23.6	Education
Planning curriculum or policy	15.1	Education
Substance abuse awareness or counseling	14.8	Public Safety
Other education	13.1	Education
Medical/health services	11.6	Human Needs
Health education	10.0	Human Needs
Conflict mediation training	9.4	Public Safety
Teaching environmental awareness	8.1	Environment
Crime prevention	6.6	Public Safety

Note: Percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6). Percentages add to more than 100 because many respondents marked more than one category.

Table 5.4 describes the locations in which participants conduct their service. Students were most likely to conduct service within an educational setting, followed by other community organizations such as religious institutions, welfare organizations, hospitals, community centers, or parks. The fact that the elementary/secondary school was the second most common location probably reflects the fact that 75 percent of LSAHE programs involve partnerships with elementary/secondary schools.

Table 5.4
Service Participation by Location of Service
(N=2,309)

Location of service	Percent
College/university	51.8
Elementary/secondary school	38.5
Church or other religious organization	36.7
Social or welfare organization	28.8
Hospital or other health organization	25.9
Community center	22.5
Park or other outdoor area	20.3
Other private organization	17.0
Sport or recreational organization	14.1
Other public organization	12.8
Local service center	12.0
Political organization ^a	5.6

Note: Percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6). Percentages add to more than 100 because many respondents marked more than one category.

^a CNS prohibits grantees from using their grants for political activities. These results do not suggest that CNS funds were used to support participation in political organizations because many students participated in service programs other than those supported with LSAHE grants.

Table 5.5 examines the sponsorship of the service activities. Students were most likely to perform service through a collegiate-sponsored activity (70 percent) (as indicated by the site visits, college-sponsored service is typically coordinated through student affairs offices). Nearly thirty percent of participants provided service as part of a class or course. Finally, nearly half of service participants provided their service independently (on their own or through off-campus groups); additional analyses indicate that the majority of those students also served through college-sponsored activities or courses.

Table 5.5
Service Participation by Type of Collegiate Sponsorship
(N=2,309)

Type of sponsorship	Percent
Part of a class or course	29.0
Part of other collegiate-sponsored activity	69.8
Independently through a noncollegiate group	47.8

Note: Percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6). Percentages add to more than 100 because many respondents marked more than one category.

The duration of service participation is shown in Table 5.6. Results indicate that those students who participated in service generally did so over an extended period of time: roughly 65 percent of the sample participated for more than three months, and over one-fourth participated for more than a year.

Table 5.6
Service Participation by Duration of Service
(N=2,309)

Duration of service	Percent
Less than 1 month	17.7
1—3 months	17.6
4—6 months	17.3
7—9 months	12.7
10—12 months	6.5
More than 12 months	28.2

Note: Percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6).

Finally, Table 5.7 reports students' reasons for participating in service. Nine out of ten students believed that helping other people is a very important reason to provide service. Approximately six out of ten students felt that either personal satisfaction, improving the community, or improving society as a whole are very important reasons for service participation. Roughly four out of ten students participated in service in order to develop new skills, work with different kinds of people, or enhance their academic learning. Three out of ten participated in service in order to fulfill their civic or social responsibility. Only about one out of ten considered résumé enhancement an important reason for participating in service. These results strongly suggest that students involved in service were motivated more by a sense of altruism than by material self-interest.

Table 5.7
Service Participation by Reasons for Participation
(N=2,309)

Reasons for participation	Percent noting reason as “very important”
To help other people	91.2
To feel personal satisfaction	66.9
To improve my community	62.5
To improve society as a whole	60.6
To develop new skills	43.2
To work with people different from me	38.1
To enhance my academic learning	37.6
To fulfill my civic/social responsibility	29.6
To enhance my résumé	13.3

Note: Percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6). Percentages add to more than 100 because many respondents marked more than one category.

D. SERVICE PARTICIPATION AND STUDENT OUTCOMES

Outcome Variables

The Corporation for National Service has identified at least three domains in which service participation is expected to promote student development: (1) civic responsibility (12 measures), (2) educational attainment (herein referred to as “academic development”) (10 measures), and (3) life skills (13 measures).

Civic Responsibility

Table 5.8 describes differences on the follow-up survey between service participants and nonparticipants on twelve civic responsibility outcomes. On all twelve measures, service participants indicated higher levels of civic responsibility than nonparticipants. The most dramatic differences are in the areas of commitment to serving the community, planning to conduct volunteer work in the near future, commitment to participating in community action programs, and satisfaction with the opportunities for community service provided by the college. In fact, a full 60 percent of service participants (compared with 28 percent of other students) believed their commitment to serving their communities had become “stronger” or “much stronger” during college. Service participants also were significantly more likely than nonparticipants to be committed to influencing social values, helping others in difficulty, promoting racial understanding, influencing the political structure, and getting involved in environmental cleanup. Similarly, service participants were less pessimistic than nonparticipants about an individual’s ability to change society.

These differences are consistent with the expectation that service participation will have a favorable impact on students' sense of civic responsibility. Could it be, however, that these differences simply resulted from self-selection? In other words, could it be that service participants demonstrated higher levels of civic responsibility than nonparticipants even *before* they became involved in service during college? If service actually *promotes* civic responsibility, then we would expect service participants to have exhibited a greater amount of *change* in civic responsibility than nonparticipants.

Table 5.9 compares the change during college in civic responsibility experienced by service participants and nonparticipants in the seven areas of civic responsibility that have identical pretests from the Freshman Survey. For all seven outcomes, service participants showed larger net gains (or smaller declines) in civic responsibility than nonparticipants. In two of these cases, service participants and nonparticipants actually changed in opposite directions: commitment to influencing social values and commitment to influencing the political structure. In other words, while students who participated in community service become more interested in effecting social and political change, non-service participants *declined* in these same areas. Further, while service participants showed some decline in their commitment to promoting racial understanding, participating in community action programs, and the environment, nonparticipants exhibited even greater declines in these areas during college.

Table 5.8
Outcome Area: Civic Responsibility

Follow-up Survey Outcome	Percent among		Difference
	Service Participants (N=2,309)	Non- Participants (N=1,141)	
Student's commitment to^a:			
Participate in community action program	42.8	19.9	+22.9
Influence social values	58.8	45.0	+13.8
Help others in difficulty	78.9	68.2	+10.7
Promote racial understanding	53.1	42.6	+10.5
Influence the political structure	28.0	18.1	+9.9
Be involved in environmental cleanup ^b	29.0	22.8	+6.2
Plans for Fall 1995			
Do volunteer work	38.6	9.0	+29.6
Participate in a community service organization	9.8	0.8	+9.0
Work for a nonprofit organization	7.8	2.4	+5.4
Commitment to serving the community ^c	60.4	27.9	+32.5
Satisfaction with college opportunities for community service ^d	75.5	38.1	+37.4
Disagreement that "Realistically, an individual can do little to change society" ^e	78.7	66.2	+12.5

Note: Except where noted, percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6)

^a Percent reporting "very important" or "essential"

^b Unweighted data

^c Self-estimate of change during college. Percent reporting "stronger" or "much stronger"

^d Percent reporting "satisfied" or "very satisfied"

^e Percent reporting "disagree somewhat" or "disagree strongly"

Table 5.9
Change During College: Civic Responsibility

Characteristic	Percent among					
	Service participants			Nonparticipants		
	Freshman	Follow-up	Change	Freshman	Follow-up	Change
Student's commitment to^a						
Participate in a community action program	45.4	42.8	-2.6	32.3	19.9	-12.4
Influence social values	51.0	58.8	+7.8	47.1	45.0	-2.1
Help others in difficulty ^b	73.6	81.4	+7.8	58.6	63.3	+4.7
Promote racial understanding	57.2	53.1	-4.1	54.6	42.6	-12.0
Influence the political structure	26.0	28.0	+2.0	21.3	18.1	-3.2
Be involved in environmental cleanup ^b	36.3	29.0	-7.3	30.6	22.8	-7.8
Disagreement that "Realistically, an individual can do little to change society" ^{b,c}	81.7	79.6	-2.1	76.1	65.8	-10.3

Note: Except where noted, percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6)

^a Percent reporting "very important" or "essential"

^b Unweighted data

^c Percent reporting "disagree somewhat" or "disagree strongly"

Academic Development

Table 5.10 describes differences between service participants and nonparticipants on academic outcomes. Students who participated in service exhibited higher levels of academic self-concept, achievement, aspirations, and academic involvement (e.g., studying, talking with faculty). The largest differences were in the areas of self-rated drive to achieve (component of academic self-concept), degree aspirations, preparation for graduate school, doing extra work for courses, and spending more time studying and interacting with faculty. These findings are consistent with the notion that service participation benefits students *academically*.

However, as with civic responsibility, it is important to question whether the differences shown in Table 5.10 occurred simply because service participants came to college with higher levels of academic preparation. Although Table 5.11 provides some preliminary answers, we had "before" and "after" measures for only two of the ten academic outcomes. According to the net change in academic outcomes reported in Table 5.11,

both service participants and nonparticipants showed equal increases in their academic self-confidence. However, given the initially high levels of academic confidence among service participants, the equal net change still results in service participants scoring higher on the post-test. Changes in aspirations for doctoral or advanced professional degrees indicate that while both groups experienced a decline in high-level degree aspirations, the decline is much smaller among service participants than nonparticipants. This suggests that service participation may have helped students remain committed to obtaining advanced degrees.¹³

¹³ The fact that students in this study experienced a net decline in advanced degree aspirations merits discussion. While this decline contradicts the general tendency of college to increase students' advanced degree aspirations (Astin, 1993), it is important to point out that LSAHE-funded institutions tend to be of higher-than-average selectivity, and therefore enroll students whose degree aspirations are very high when they come to college. In fact, while 40 percent of students in this sample planned doctoral or advanced professional degrees as freshmen, these aspirations were held by only 24 percent of freshmen nationwide in 1991 (the modal freshman year in this sample) (Astin, Dey, Korn, and Riggs, 1991). The net decline in advanced degree aspirations probably reflects a trend toward greater realism in their degree plans over time: changes in career interests and financial situations will lead many students to decide not to attend graduate school.

Table 5.10
Outcome Area: Academic Development

Follow-up Survey Outcome	Percent among		Difference
	Service Participants (N=2,309)	Non-Participants (N=1,141)	
Mean academic self-concept ^a	19.5	18.7	+0.8
Change^b during college:			
Preparation for graduate or professional school	71.8	57.5	+14.3
Increase in general knowledge	97.7	91.4	+6.3
Increase in knowledge of a field or discipline	95.6	90.6	+5.0
Did extra work for courses	74.9	57.8	+17.1
Aspirations for doctoral or advanced professional degrees	35.4	25.3	+10.1
Retained ^c	98.2	96.4	+1.8
Average College Grades:			
B+ to A	48.6	45.2	+3.4
C+ to B	46.7	48.1	-1.4
C or less	4.6	6.7	-2.1
Hours per week devoted to studying and homework:			
More than 20	19.4	11.8	+7.6
16 to 20	16.0	14.2	+1.8
11 to 15	20.4	19.7	+0.7
6 to 10	24.4	27.1	-2.7
3 to 5	14.9	14.6	+0.3
2 or less	4.9	12.5	-7.6
Hours per week talking with faculty outside of class:			
6 or more	2.4	1.6	+0.8
3 to 5	10.0	4.5	+5.5
1 to 2	36.0	26.6	+9.4
Less than 1	43.8	49.0	-5.2
None	7.8	18.4	-10.6

Note: Percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6)

^a Mean academic self-concept represents the mean score on a composite of the following five measures of self-concept, each scored on a scale of 1 to 5: Drive to achieve, writing ability, academic ability, intellectual self-confidence, and mathematical ability.

^b Percent reporting "stronger" or "much stronger."

^c Percent who have earned bachelor's degree or plan to attend college in the fall.

Table 5.11
Change During College: Academic Development

Characteristic	Percent among					
	Service participants			Nonparticipants		
	Freshman	Follow-up	Change	Freshman	Follow-up	Change
Mean academic self-concept ^a	19.2	19.5	+0.3	18.4	18.7	+0.3
Aspirations for doctoral or advanced professional degrees	41.3	35.4	-5.9	39.1	25.3	-13.8

Note: Percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6)

^a Mean academic self-concept represents the mean score on a composite of the following five measures of self-concept, each scored on a scale of 1 to 5: Drive to achieve, writing ability, academic ability, intellectual self-confidence, and mathematical ability.

Life Skills

Differences in life skills outcomes between service participants and nonparticipants are provided in Table 5.12. In all thirteen outcome areas, service participants displayed higher scores than nonparticipants. The largest differences were in the area of satisfaction. Service participants were much more satisfied than nonparticipants with the leadership opportunities provided by their college and were more satisfied with the relevance of their coursework to everyday life. Service participants also had much higher levels of self-confidence in their leadership abilities and somewhat higher levels of social self-confidence than did nonparticipants. Finally, students performing service reported greater changes than nonparticipants in areas related to their understanding of local and national problems, as well as in interpersonal skills including cooperation and conflict resolution.

These differences are consistent with the expectation that service participation will have a positive effect on the development of important life skills. Again, however, we must question whether the students who chose to participate in service during college simply *came* to college with more strongly developed life skills than students who did not become involved in service. While it is not possible to accurately pretest student *satisfaction* with college, we were able to compare *changes* in life skills between freshman year and the follow-up survey for two of the 13 life skills measures. Moreover, the self-change items in Table 5.12 approximate pre-test post-test changes.

As indicated in Table 5.13, service participation appears to promote the development of these two life skills. Service participants reported greater increases in their social self-

confidence than nonparticipants did; and while service participants reported a net increase in leadership ability during college, nonparticipants experienced a *decline* in this area. These two net changes, coupled with the self-reported changes described in Table 5.12, indicate that participating in service activities during college is associated with greater than average development of many skills important in life after college.

Table 5.12
Outcome Area: Life Skills

Follow-up Survey Outcome	Percent among		Difference
	Service Participants (N=2,309)	Non-Participants (N=1,141)	
Leadership ability ^a	65.6	52.1	+13.5
Social self-confidence ^a	59.7	52.3	+7.4
Change^b during college in:			
Understanding community problems	73.5	59.2	+14.3
Knowledge of different races/cultures	69.9	56.0	+13.9
Acceptance of different races/cultures	61.0	47.2	+13.8
Interpersonal skills	87.9	75.6	+12.3
Understanding of nation's social problems	76.6	65.0	+11.6
Ability to work cooperatively	76.1	65.7	+10.4
Conflict resolution skills	75.8	69.1	+6.7
Ability to think critically	88.3	85.1	+3.2
Satisfaction^c with college's:			
Leadership opportunities	60.1	37.2	+22.9
Relevance of coursework to everyday life	66.3	49.3	+17.0
Preparation for future career	85.5	82.1	+3.4

Note: Percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6)

^a Percent reporting "above average" or "highest 10%"

^b Self-estimate of change during college. Percent reporting "stronger" or "much stronger"

^c Percent reporting "satisfied" or "very satisfied"

Table 5.13
Change During College: Life Skills

Characteristic	Percent among					
	Service participants			Nonparticipants		
	Freshman	Follow-up	Change	Freshman	Follow-up	Change
Social self-confidence ^a	50.0	59.7	+9.7	47.2	52.3	+5.1
Leadership ability ^a	63.5	65.6	+2.1	54.7	52.1	-2.6

Note: Percentages based on weighted data (see Appendix F.6)

^a Percent reporting "above average" or "highest 10%"

E. EFFECTS OF SERVICE PARTICIPATION

Thus far, results indicate that service participants demonstrated a greater sense of civic responsibility, higher levels of academic achievement, and more highly developed life skills than did students who did not participate in service during college. Outcomes that could be pretested from the Freshman Survey show that service participation tended to be associated with stronger net gains in student development. These results suggest that service participation did indeed have a positive effect on students. However, we must still consider the possibility that the differences between participants and nonparticipants were due to the *types* of students who chose to become involved in service in college. For example, it could be that service participants experienced larger gains in civic responsibility than nonparticipants because they possessed characteristics that *predisposed* them to increase their civic responsibility (e.g., an early commitment to helping others or influencing social change). This section therefore focuses on the effects of service participation after *controlling* for characteristics of students that predisposed them to engage in service work. Complete details on analyses that examine the effects of different *types* of participation (e.g., education, human needs) are provided in Appendices F and H.

The results presented in this section are based on 35 separate regression analyses, one for each outcome variable. Regression analysis is an analytical technique which allows us to examine whether service participation had an effect on students *after* controlling for characteristics that predisposed them to engage in service, as well as any factors in the larger college environment that might also have affected these same outcomes. In effect, these analyses "matched" service participants and nonparticipants statistically in terms of their predisposition to engage in service.

Tables 5.14 provides the standardized regression coefficients (Betas) for service participation on the twelve civic responsibility outcomes. Service participation had positive effects on all twelve civic responsibility outcomes. Not surprisingly, service participation had the strongest effect on students' satisfaction with opportunities for community service provided by the college. As a consequence of service participation, students also became more committed to serving their communities and helping others. Service participants also become *less* inclined to feel that individuals have little power to change society.

Table 5.14
Effects of Service Participation on Civic Responsibility

Outcome	Effect size ^a
Satisfaction with college on opportunities for community service	.32
Commitment to serving the community	.28
Plans to do volunteer work in Fall 1995	.23
Commitment to participate in a community action program	.21
Commitment to help others who are in difficulty	.14
Disagreement that "Realistically an individual can do little to bring about changes in our society."	.12
Plans to participate in a community service organization in Fall 1995	.11
Commitment to influence social values	.10
Commitment to help promote racial understanding	.10
Commitment to influence the political structure	.07
Commitment to be involved in programs to help clean-up the environment	.06
Plans to work for a nonprofit organization in Fall 1995	.06

^a Standardized regression coefficient (Beta) after entering student characteristics and college environments were controlled. All coefficients are statistically significant at $p < .01$.

The effects of service participation on the ten outcomes related to academic development are shown in Table 5.15. Once again, each of the outcomes was positively influenced by service participation, although the effects of service were somewhat smaller than they were on civic responsibility outcomes. Service participation had its strongest effects on students' academic involvement (e.g., contact with faculty, doing extra work for courses, and studying/homework) and plans to obtain graduate/professional degrees.

Table 5.15
Effects of Service Participation on Academic Development

Outcome	Effect size ^a
Amount of contact with faculty	.12
Aspirations for advanced degrees	.09
Did extra work for courses	.08
Time devoted to studying/homework	.07
Preparation for graduate/professional school	.07
College grade point average	.05
Persistence in college (retention)	.04
General knowledge	.04
Academic self-concept	.04
Knowledge of a field or discipline	.03

^a Standardized regression coefficient (Beta) after entering student characteristics and college environments were controlled. All coefficients are statistically significant at $p < .01$.

Table 5.16 shows that service participation had positive effects on all thirteen life skills outcomes. The strongest effects of service were in the areas of leadership development and understanding of national and community problems. Service participation also enhanced students' interpersonal skills, including conflict resolution skills, the ability to work cooperatively, and the ability to get along with people of different races/cultures.

Table 5.16
Effects of Service Participation on Life Skills

Outcome	Effect size ^a
Satisfaction with college's leadership opportunities	.18
Understanding of problems facing the community	.13
Leadership ability	.11
Understanding of problems facing our nation	.09
Interpersonal skills	.09
Satisfaction with relevance of coursework to everyday life	.09
Ability to get along with people of different races/cultures	.08
Conflict resolution skills	.08
Ability to work cooperatively	.08
Preparation for future career	.08
Knowledge of people of different races/cultures	.08
Ability to think critically	.07
Social self-confidence	.04

^a Standardized regression coefficient (Beta) after entering student characteristics and college environments were controlled. All coefficients are statistically significant at $p < .01$.

Two caveats are needed in interpreting the findings in this section. First, as with all quasi-experimental research, it is possible that one or more potentially biasing variables have not been controlled. Second, although all of these findings describe positive effects of service on student development, it is important to point out that, as with nearly any specific program or activity, effect sizes were generally small; service participation tended to account for a small proportion of the variance in student development. Nevertheless, the effects of service on all outcomes remained significantly positive even after controlling for numerous student characteristics, including the predisposition to engage in service, as well as various aspects of the college environment that also predict development of these outcomes. Therefore, these results do suggest that service participation benefits students at least modestly in all 35 outcome areas.

F. DURATION AND SPONSORSHIP OF SERVICE

The follow-up questionnaire also afforded us an opportunity to determine whether certain other aspects of students' service experiences had any significant effects on the 35 outcome measures. These other features included the duration or length of time that the student participated in the service activity and the sponsorship or auspices under which the service was carried out. (A summary of effects of the site where the service is performed is provided in Appendix H.)

Effects of Duration of Service

Duration of service was measured in terms of the number of months that the student devoted to service participation during the prior year. Given the uniformly positive effects of service described in this chapter, it is no surprise that the amount of time (from 0 months to 12 months) showed significant effects on thirty-four of the thirty-five outcome measures. The substantive question to be explored here, however, is whether the amount of time devoted to service contributes anything to these outcomes over and above the effects of service participation per se. As shown in Table 5.17, duration of service did indeed have significant positive effects on twelve of the thirty-five outcomes, effects that could not be attributed simply to participation itself. Most of these effects occurred in the areas of civic responsibility (five outcomes) and life skills (five outcomes). In the area of academic development, duration of service contributed significantly to the prediction of increased knowledge of a field or discipline and amount of contact with faculty. These latter results suggest that longer periods of service may tend to occur in conjunction with coursework in the major.

In short, these results suggest a positive association between the amount of time devoted to providing service and student development, especially in the areas of civic responsibility and life skill development. That duration of service would not contribute to most measures of academic development is perhaps to be expected, given that there is necessarily a trade-off involved: the academic benefits normally associated with providing service may be counterbalanced by the reduction of time that is available for strictly academic pursuits. This is not to say that devoting a good deal of time to service activities necessarily impedes academic development, but simply that a heavy involvement in service activities may frequently reduce the amount of time available for students to devote specifically to formal academic pursuits. The direct academic benefit of service (Table 5.15) is thus counterbalanced by the loss of time.

Table 5.17
Significant Effects of Duration of Service

Outcome area	Outcome positively affected by duration of service ^a
Civic responsibility	Commitment to participating in a community action program Commitment to helping others in difficulty Planning to do volunteer work in Fall 1995 Commitment to serving the community Satisfaction with college's opportunities for community service
Academic development	Increase in knowledge of a field or discipline Amount of contact with faculty
Life skills	Ability to think critically Conflict resolution skills Understanding of problems facing our nation Understanding of problems facing the community Satisfaction with college's leadership opportunities

^a After entering student characteristics, college environments, and main effects of service participation were controlled

Sponsorship of Service

The students' service work could be performed under one of three possible auspices: independently through a noncollegiate group or organization, in connection with a collegiate organization (usually student affairs), and as part of a course. Regression results show that once the main effects of service participation were taken into account, the type of sponsorship contributed to a total of fifteen outcomes (nine civic responsibility, two academic development, and four life skills) (see Table 5.18).

Service provided as part of a course had positive effects on a total of nine outcomes, most in the area of civic responsibility, indicating that course-based service helped to reinforce students' commitment to serving the community. In the area of life skills, course-based service promoted students' career preparation, skills in conflict resolution, and understanding of problems facing the community. In all likelihood this latter finding reflects the fact that the content of many service-learning courses is often focused on contemporary social problems. Course-based service also contributed to academic development by increasing students' amount of interaction with faculty.

Service performed through collegiate nonacademic sponsorship added significantly to the prediction of students' commitment to continued participation in the community, students' satisfaction with collegiate opportunities for community service, and students' satisfaction with collegiate opportunities for leadership development. In the case of this last outcome, collegiate nonacademic sponsorship produced a stronger effect than either type or duration of service. Among other things, this result reinforces the notion that the area of Student Affairs is a fertile ground for the development of student leadership abilities. Such a result is consistent not only with recent research on college student development (Astin, 1993) but also with recent developments in the area of programs for leadership development at the undergraduate level (Working Ensemble, 1995).

Service performed under the auspices of an independent (noncollegiate) group or organization added significantly to the prediction of eight outcomes. Except for its effect on one measure of academic development (increase in general knowledge), all effects of service conducted independently were in the area of civic responsibility. Above and beyond the service experience itself, the act of conducting service "on their own" caused students to become even more committed to continued involvement in community service work. These effects suggest that noncollegiate sponsorship may involve the kinds of service opportunities that either get students committed to service or that simply involve longer term projects.

Table 5.18
Significant Effects of Sponsorship of Service

Outcome positively affected by sponsorship of service ^a	Type of sponsorship		
	Course	Other college group	Independently or through off-campus group
<u>Civic Responsibility</u>			
Help others in difficulty			X
Satisfaction with college's opportunities for service		X	X
Commitment to serving the community	X	X	X
Plan to participate in a community service org.	X		
Plan to participate in a non- profit organization	X		X
Plan to do volunteer work in Fall 1995			X
Commitment to influence political structures	X		
Commitment to promote racial understanding			X
Commitment to participate in a community action program	X	X	X
<u>Academic Development</u>			
Amount of contact with faculty	X		
Increase in general knowledge			X
<u>Life Skills</u>			
Satisfaction with college's leadership opportunities		X	
Preparation for a career	X		
Increase in understanding of community problems	X		
Conflict resolution skills	X		

^a After entering student characteristics, college environments, and main effects of service participation were controlled

G. CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has described the impact of service participation at LSAHE institutions on three general areas of student development: civic responsibility, academic development, and life skills. Survey results are based on freshman and follow-up data collected from 3,450 students attending 42 LSAHE institutions. These respondents include 2,309 service participants and 1,141 nonparticipants.

Most Students Participated in Service as a Co-curricular Activity

College sponsored co-curricular activity was the primary vehicle through which students engage in service activities, with one-third of students participating in service through their classes. The majority of participants at LSAHE institutions conducted their service in educational settings. Over half of student in the sample had tutored or taught youth. Other popular categories of service included the environment (primarily conservation and community cleanup) and human needs (primarily personal counseling/mentoring and childcare). Finally, students were motivated to participate in service much more by a sense of altruism than by self-interest: the primary reasons for participating in service included helping others and improving the community, while the least popular reason was to enhance one's résumé.

When Compared with Nonparticipants, Service Participants Exhibited Higher Levels of Civic Responsibility, Academic Achievement, and Life Skills

Such differences between service participants and nonparticipants were not simply reflections of the types of students who became involved in service. In most categories of student development, service participants experienced larger relative gains than nonparticipants. Two of the most prominent areas of net gain for service participants were the commitment to influencing social values, commitment to helping others, and the level of social self-confidence. Further, whereas service participants displayed increases in their commitment to influencing social values and influencing the political structure, nonparticipants reported declines in these areas.

Participation in Service was Positively Associated with 35 Outcome Variables

While these simple comparisons of participants and nonparticipants show that there was a positive *relationship* between service participation and student development, evidence of the actual *impact* of service participation was best obtained through multivariate, longitudinal analyses conducted before and after the students' service experience. These analyses, which controlled for freshman factors that predispose students to become

engaged in service during college, assessed the effects of service involvement on 35 measures of student development across three outcome areas: civic responsibility, academic development, and life skills.

Multivariate results show that every one of the 35 outcomes was favorably influenced by engagement in service. Service participation positively affected students' commitment to their communities, to helping others in difficulty, to promoting racial understanding, and to influencing social values. In addition, service participation directly influenced the development of important life skills, such as leadership ability, social self-confidence, critical thinking, and conflict resolution. Service participation also had unique positive effects on academic development, including knowledge gained, grades earned, degrees sought, and time devoted to academic endeavors. Further, extended duration of service activities led to stronger effects of service, particularly in the areas of civic responsibility and life skills.

Although the effects of service participation were generally modest, as service is only one of many factors that influences student development, the fact is that an experience in which students were engaged an average of 35 hours over the course of the academic year had a positive effect on all 35 outcomes, even when these students' pre-college tendencies to participate in service were controlled. Thus, these results provide evidence that participating in service activities during the undergraduate years enhances students' academic development, life skill development, and sense of civic responsibility.

6. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

A. WHAT WORK WAS PERFORMED BY LSAHE PROGRAMS?

The Annual Accomplishments Survey and site visits indicate that LSAHE grantees successfully implemented an array of capacity building and direct service activities. Major findings about LSAHE activities include:

- Subgranting greatly extended the reach of LSAHE. Twenty-six (26) of 116 LSAHE grantees used their awards to administer subgrants to other institutions, some of whom then awarded subsubgrants. In this way, over 500 colleges and universities, or about one in every seven colleges and universities nationwide, participated in LSAHE.
- A typical LSAHE program included both capacity building and direct service activities. All of those responding to the Annual Accomplishments Survey devoted at least some time to building the higher education sector's capacity for service. Three quarters integrated service-learning into the curriculum, creating over 1,000 new courses. Two-thirds provided technical assistance on topics such as how to develop service-learning courses or how to link higher education institutions and community organizations. Other capacity building activities included developing publications (50 percent of respondents), and building clearinghouses, databases or other information resources (38 percent). Slightly over three-quarters (78 percent) of Annual Accomplishments Survey respondents also included direct service in their LSAHE program.
- Most grantees involved in direct service worked in multiple service areas. Three-quarters (75 percent) involved students in service to promote school success among K-12 youth, and slightly over half (53 percent) involved students in helping homeless, impoverished, elderly, or disabled people. Others provided services to enhance neighborhood environments (38 percent), foster school readiness and literacy (37 percent), improve health (37 percent), prevent crime (31 percent), and improve natural environments (24 percent). Respondents were least likely to work in the area of crime control (18 percent).
- Sample accomplishments in various service areas include: (1) student volunteers provided assistance to over 1,800 K-12 teachers; (2) student volunteers served 487 soup kitchens or shelters and organized almost 200 food and clothing drives; (3) volunteers taught 180 conflict mediation courses and mediated over 250 disputes; and (4) volunteers tested over 200 buildings for environmental hazards.

B. WHAT WERE LSAHE IMPACTS ON SERVICE RECIPIENTS?

During the spring of 1995, staff from 443 community agencies and schools completed the Community Impact Survey, which assessed the contributions of student volunteers to their communities. Ten site visits extended and confirmed the survey data. Major findings include:

- Respondents perceived the student volunteers from LSAHE institutions as highly effective in promoting the goals of the community organizations they served. Almost three quarters (71 percent) of the community organizations responding to the survey reported that the student volunteers enabled them to increase the quality of their services. Additionally, 61 percent increased the intensity of services provided (i.e., the amount of services per recipient), 59 percent increased the variety of services offered, and 52 percent were able to serve more people. Moreover, responses indicate that student volunteers supplemented rather than replaced other volunteer labor. The student volunteers had little impact upon the number and workload of paid staff.
- Student volunteers from LSAHE institutions were perceived as highly effective in serving the needs of clients. Respondents to the Community Impact Survey assigned students high ratings for their contributions in the areas of education, health, public safety, and environment. For example, student volunteers received mean ratings above 4.0 on a five-point scale (indicating a “very high” level of effectiveness) for their efforts in “improving students’ school achievement,” “promoting children’s readiness for school,” “improving conditions for low-income or homeless people,” and “conserving or restoring natural habitats.”
- Staff from community organizations assessed the student volunteers as especially skilled in working with youth. Respondents reported the greatest strength of student volunteers to be their enthusiasm and interpersonal skills. They perceived the students’ greatest weakness to be lack of time for volunteer work due to competing demands of school, employment, and extracurricular activities.
- Respondents rated student volunteers from LSAHE institutions as substantially more effective than other volunteers, including volunteers from non-LSAHE colleges and universities. They rated the student volunteers as equal in effectiveness to paid staff.
- Almost all community organization respondents (97 percent) indicated that they would like to work with student volunteers again if given the opportunity. Similarly, 92 percent responded that the benefits of working with student volunteers outweighed the problems and costs.

C. WHAT WERE LSAHE IMPACTS ON INSTITUTIONS?

The Annual Accomplishments and Community Impact surveys reveal increasing support and capacity for service activities within higher education institutions.

- LSAHE colleges and universities support service-learning in a variety of ways. Almost all the institutions responding to the Annual Accomplishments Survey (92 percent) have integrated service into curriculum. Three-quarters (75 percent) house a volunteer or service center. Two-thirds (68 percent) offer rewards or recognition for student and faculty involvement in service. On the other hand, only 10 percent require service to graduate, and less than one-third (31 percent) include service in the core curriculum.
- The implementation of LSAHE was associated with growing support for service-learning. One-third (33 percent) of the institutions responding to the Annual Accomplishments Survey developed service-learning courses for the first time in 1994-95. Close to one third of responding institutions (30 percent) established faculty committees on service-learning, and an equal number began offering service-learning course development funds to faculty.
- The implementation of LSAHE was associated with improving relations between higher education institutions and community organizations. Community organizations responding to the Community Impact Survey reported increasing cooperation and collaboration with LSAHE institutions through such activities as joint service projects and participation on committees.

D. WHAT WERE LSAHE IMPACTS ON STUDENT VOLUNTEERS?

The UCLA Follow-up Survey indicates that students who participated in community service showed greater gains in civic responsibility, academic achievement, and life skills compared to those who did not. Even stronger evidence of the impact of service participation emerges from multivariate, longitudinal analyses conducted before and after students' service experiences. Such analyses enable investigators to control for factors that might predispose students to participate in service.

- Simple comparisons of Follow-up Survey responses between service participants and nonparticipants indicate that service participants exhibited a greater sense of civic responsibility (e.g., commitment to serving the community), higher levels of academic achievement (e.g., academic self-concept, grades, degree aspirations), and more growth in life skills (e.g., leadership self-confidence, interpersonal skills).

- Comparisons of change over time between the pre-test (Freshman Survey) and Follow-up Survey responses of service participants and nonparticipants indicate that, in most categories of student development, service participants experienced larger relative gains than did nonparticipants. For example, service participants showed larger net gains than nonparticipants in their commitment to helping others and level of social self-confidence. Further, whereas service participants displayed increases in their commitment to influencing social values and influencing the political structure, nonparticipants reported declines in these areas.
- Multivariate results indicate that every one of 35 outcome measures was favorably influenced by engagement in some form of service work, even after controlling for a wide variety of input and environmental factors. Service participation positively affected students' commitment to serving their communities, helping others in difficulty, and promoting racial understanding. A similar pattern was observed for the development of such life skills as leadership ability, social self-confidence, critical thinking, and conflict resolution. Service participation also had positive effects on academic development, including grades, time devoted to academic endeavors, degree aspirations, and self-reported gains in knowledge. Thus, participating in service activities substantially enhanced students' development in the areas of civic responsibility, life skills, and academics.

E. CONCLUSION

At the end of its first year, LSAHE grantees were actively engaged in a wide variety of capacity building and direct service activities. Moreover, results indicate that these activities were achieving the three major goals of LSAHE. First, community organizations strongly valued the contributions of student volunteers and perceived the students as highly effective in meeting both organizational and client needs. Second, institutions were increasing their capacity and support for service-learning, particularly by developing new service-learning courses. Relations between higher education institutions and community organizations also improved during the year. Third, participation in service was associated with gains in student learning and development. Students participating in service showed greater increases in civic responsibility, academic achievement, and life skills than did nonparticipating students.