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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Designing an Impact Evaluation Framework for buildOn’s Afterschool Youth Program

August 23, 2010

buildOn is a youth development organization based in Stamford, CT that educates and empowers high school students by engaging them in local community service and fundraising efforts to build schools in developing countries. buildOn operates in 118 high schools in seven major metropolitan areas, and since its inception in 1991, has built 364 schools in six developing countries (buildOn, “What We’ve Done,” 2010).

buildOn’s current “proof of impact” methodology largely focuses on program outputs – i.e., the numbers that result from the activities described above. For example, buildOn’s website and marketing advertise the following numbers:

- 1,400,000 lives touched
- 52,000 children
- 548,087 hours served

While these numbers are impressive, they do not address the impact of buildOn’s programming on program participants. buildOn asked the Heller team to design an impact evaluation framework for the organization’s afterschool program. The management challenge proposal highlighted the organization’s concern with measures of academic achievement, as well as the program’s impact on leadership development, staff/student relationships, and future educational or career goals. This focus on evaluation is prompted by growing donor interest in measuring program impact – in particular, several influential foundations’ interest in demonstrating academic achievement gains as a result of youth development programs.

After meetings and interviews with program staff and students, a review of the current literature on youth development outcomes and evaluation methods, and an analysis of comparable organizations, the Heller team concluded that a clear articulation of buildOn’s desired program outcomes was needed. Before creating tools to measure impact, the Heller team needed to clearly define the nature of that impact.

To this end, the team worked with students and staff to develop an organizational Theory of Change (TOC). A theory of change is a commonly used program design and evaluation framework that lays out the activities and outcomes of a program, as well as the assumptions that link these activities with the desired outcomes. The Heller team conducted a participatory process with buildOn students and staff to identify program outcomes and brainstorm ways these outcomes could be measured (refer to Appendix C). Through this process, the Heller team identified the following ten outcomes of
buildOn’s afterschool program:

- Academic Engagement
- Agency
- Civic Engagement
- Empathy & Compassion
- Empowerment
- Expanded Awareness of Social Issues
- Hope/Expanded Sense of Possibility
- Leadership & Teamwork Skills
- Personal and Social Development
- Self-Worth

The Heller team illustrated buildOn’s program inputs, activities, assumptions, and outcomes using a Logic Model – a visual representation of the organization’s Theory of Change. In addition, the team created a brief TOC statement that buildOn can use in its grants going forward.

With these outcomes in mind, the Heller team researched commonly used evaluation techniques and considered what techniques are being used by comparable organizations, such as YouthBuild, City Year, and Summer Search (refer to Appendix H). In response to the buildOn leadership’s interest in academics, the team further researched academic engagement and the links between buildOn outcomes and academic achievement, as well as methods for collecting academic metrics such as grades and test scores.

Based on a thorough understanding and analysis of buildOn’s outcomes, organizational capacity, and comparable organizations, the team developed a set of recommendations for evaluating program impact.

To address donor interest in academic gains, the team recommends buildOn begin by highlighting the links between buildOn’s core competencies and academic achievement. The team also recommends that buildOn begin collecting transcripts on a pilot basis, due to concerns about logistical difficulties and uncertainty of results.

To evaluate impact, the Heller team created a “menu” of tiered evaluation steps for both the short-term and long-term. The team also offered specific recommendations and “how-to” guides for implementation. The team composed and piloted a survey that measures the ten identified buildOn outcomes. Starting as soon as this upcoming academic year, the team recommends that buildOn administer the impact survey in the fall and again in the spring, to measure changes in outcomes. Additionally, the team recommends that buildOn conduct focus groups, key informant interviews, and a comparison group study. In the long-term, buildOn should gather evaluation information from alumni via focus groups and a longitudinal study.
Finally, the team recommends that buildOn use the evaluation results to initiate an organization-wide conversation on program effectiveness and desired outcomes. The TOC framework can serve as a helpful tool to facilitate such a conversation and reach organizational consensus about the goals of buildOn’s afterschool program.
INTRODUCTION

buildOn is a $6 million, U.S.-based nonprofit organization whose mission is to enhance education and empower youth in the U.S. to make a positive difference in their communities while helping people of developing countries increase their self-reliance through education. Since its inception in 1991, buildOn has built 364 schools around the world (in Haiti, Senegal, Malawi, Mali, Nepal and Nicaragua) and operates an afterschool program in 118 high schools in seven major metropolitan areas (Philadelphia, New York City, San Francisco, Oakland, Detroit, Southern Connecticut, and Chicago).

buildOn’s distinctive service model engages urban high school students in carrying out local community service projects and promoting literacy in developing countries. The three main components of buildOn’s programming are community service, global education and sponsorship (students raise funds to help build elementary schools overseas). Each year, two program members from each high school are selected for the Trek for Knowledge, in which they spend two weeks helping to build a school in a developing country.

buildOn charged the Heller MBA Consulting Team (Christina Chien, Caitlin Deschenes-Desmond, Elle McPherson, Abra Pollock, and L. Katie Schlepp) with designing an impact evaluation framework for the organization’s afterschool program. The proposal highlighted buildOn’s specific interest in how to measure the academic gains and increased empowerment that the organization believed to be occurring among the program participants.

Based on its review of internal documents, the Heller team concluded that a clear articulation of buildOn’s desired program outcomes was needed in order to design an impact evaluation. To this end, the team conducted a participatory process with students and staff to develop an organizational Theory of Change (TOC) for buildOn. The collaborative TOC identified the ten impact outcomes that the team then designed an evaluation framework to measure.

The team recommends that buildOn immediately implement pre- and post-surveys in its afterschool program in order to measure these outcomes. Additionally, the team has provided a “menu of options” for short-term and long-term evaluation steps, and an implementation plan and “how-to” guides for short-term steps. buildOn can select from among the options as its evaluation needs and resources evolve. Above all, the team hopes that buildOn will benefit from these evaluation tools as a vehicle for program improvement and organizational learning.
METHODOLOGY

The Heller team began its process by gathering insights from buildOn stakeholders. Interviews with the organization’s leadership team guided the project’s direction, and the team agreed to produce the following deliverables:

- Review of comparable organizations’ current impact evaluation practices
- Literature review of evaluation tools and best practices
- Impact evaluation framework for buildOn’s afterschool programs

Review of Comparable Organizations
The Heller team’s selection of comparable organizations was guided by consultation with buildOn staff, as well as staff at Brandeis University’s Center for Youth and Communities (CYC). Because buildOn’s program model is so distinctive, it was difficult to find an exact match in terms of comparable organizations. Therefore, the comparables were chosen based on their fit with various program elements, such as community service or mentoring. In addition, the comparable organization had to have conducted an evaluation similar to the one proposed by buildOn. A full list of the comparable organizations researched and their evaluation practices can be found in Appendix H.

Literature Review
The literature review process provided valuable insight to direct the evaluation framework process. In reviewing internal buildOn documents, as well as resources on evaluation approaches and best practices, it became apparent that buildOn’s current evaluation system focuses primarily on program outputs – such as the number of community service hours served by student – and not on impact.

Developing a Theory of Change
In order to identify the outcomes of buildOn’s afterschool program, the Heller team led a participatory theory of change design process that incorporated insights from staff, students and members of the buildOn leadership team. The theory of change design process included the following steps:

- Among themselves, the Heller team conducted a theory of change development exercise taken from the Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development (2005, p. 24).

- The team led a student workshop with 10 buildOn participants in the Bronx, NY. Various exercises allowed the youth to share their experience with the buildOn program and the impact it has had on their lives. An outline of the youth workshop can be found in Appendix C.
Third, the team conducted a similar workshop in the Bronx with select buildOn staff members from NY and CT in order to incorporate their perspective on program outcomes, as well as possible indicators for measuring the changes in participants' attitudes, knowledge, and behavior. An outline of the staff workshop can be found in Appendix C.

Upon concluding the three workshops, the team incorporated all of the information into a collaborative logic model, found in Appendix A. This logic model demonstrates the identified outcomes of the program, as well as the assumptions that serve as the causal links between program activities and intended outcomes. The logic model and outcomes serve as a foundation for the impact evaluation framework designed by the Heller team.

With this foundation in place, the team began the evaluation design process. The team benefited from numerous helpful consultations with CYC staff. The team designed and piloted its impact survey with a group of buildOn students in CT in order to test for question clarity and comprehension. Student feedback was then incorporated into the final survey design for the pre-and post-survey.

Recommendations for both short- and long-term evaluation options were developed based on in-depth research on evaluation models and studies carried out by comparable organizations. The team based its implementation recommendations on buildOn’s current program model and core competencies. As buildOn moves forward with its evaluation strategy, the tools developed by the Heller team will serve as meaningful, working documents that can grow and change in relation to the organization’s needs.
RESULTS

Analysis of buildOn’s Current Evaluation Efforts

buildOn’s current evaluation efforts consist primarily of a year-end survey administered to both staff and students, tracking of Key Performance Indicators, and student essays.

The student survey is administered online through SurveyMonkey, as well as via paper surveys that Program Coordinators (PCs) collect and then manually enter into SurveyMonkey. SurveyMonkey is a low-cost tool that allows buildOn to analyze evaluation results through various filters. The evaluation results are disseminated to staff and used to inform and improve programming decisions.

An analysis of student survey results showed that in 2010, 1,613 students completed the year-end survey – a 130% increase from the previous year (buildOn, “2009-2008 Student Survey”). Overall, the year-end survey appears to be well-received by the participants, as the majority of questions had over a 90% response rate. The 34-question length did not deter participants, as response rates only dropped from 100% for question one to 92% for question 34. It is important to note, however, that the content of the current survey focuses heavily on student demographics: 16 of the 34 questions ask for student information, while just six questions relate to program impact. Appendix G outlines the full analysis of buildOn’s 2010 survey (buildOn, “Student Survey Results, 2010”).

While the afterschool program currently lacks explicit program outcomes to use as measures of impact, the year-end survey does give some indication of the program’s positive impact on youth. For instance, 95.9% of respondents reported that buildOn had contributed to their feelings of being able to make a difference. Respondents specifically agreed they had gained the following skills from buildOn’s programming (“Student Survey Results, 2010”):

- Ability to make a difference (81%)
- Knowledge of the community (76%)
- Teamwork skills (74%)
- Awareness of global issues (64%)
- A sense of purpose (59.2%)
- Leadership skills (56.9%); and
- Self-confidence (50.7%)

In addition, student essays and alumni quotes demonstrate that the program has a profound impact on participants’ lives – in the choices that they make, and in their feelings of responsibility and commitment to the local and global communities they serve.
In addition to the year-end survey, buildOn collects monthly data by region using its Key Performance Indicators (KPI). This information suggests a performance-oriented organizational culture, since the system of collecting and analyzing KPI data provides buildOn with a valuable source of information for program improvements.

buildOn’s original attempt to evaluate the impact of its programming was in 2004. buildOn, then known as “Building with Books,” or BwB, asked a CYC team to design an impact assessment survey, which was known as a “Management Information and Evaluation System” (MIES). After piloting the MIES in six schools in 2005, BwB conducted pre- and post-surveys with participants at 30 schools during the 2006-2007 school year. Pre- and post-surveys were also administered with a comparable group of students at schools who were not involved in BwB (buildOn, "Building with Books Student Survey Results, 2007").

The MIES fell into disuse in 2007. Organizational leadership attributes the survey’s discontinuation to an evolution of buildOn’s programming, to the point that the tool was no longer “the right fit.” Furthermore, buildOn staff did not feel a sense of ownership in the process, since the tool design, data collection, and data analysis were conducted by an outside evaluator. Lastly, buildOn’s evaluation needs evolved, as donors now request more information on the program’s impact on academic achievement and engagement. As Abby Hurst, Vice President of U.S. Programs, put it, “The conversation shifted towards the implication of empowerment on students’ lives – specifically, how does that student perform in standard or objective measurements of success, such as GPAs, grade promotion, test scores, etc.?”

**Heller TOC and Logic Model**

Although a review of buildOn’s current evaluation efforts – particularly the qualitative information from students and alumni – indicated that the program has considerable impact, the full scope and precise definition of desired outcomes remained unclear. Before creating tools to measure impact, the Heller team needed clarity on precisely what needed to be measured.

In order to better understand the program’s impact, the Heller team conducted a Theory of Change (TOC) exercise. A TOC is a statement of how an organization believes it is achieving impact. The exercise utilized by the team involved listing the activities of the afterschool program, and identifying the outcomes of those activities. The team brainstormed ideas for activities and outcomes based on interviews with buildOn leadership and a review of internal buildOn documents. Most importantly, the team focused on clarifying the assumptions behind buildOn’s choice of activities -- i.e., the causal links between those activities and the outcomes.

This exercise, while based on information from buildOn leadership and literature, needed to be validated and enriched by input from students and program staff, who see the effects of buildOn’s program firsthand. Thus, the Heller team conducted workshops
with buildOn students and staff in the Bronx. Through this thoughtful, participatory process, the team arrived at the following ten outcomes and definitions:

- **Academic Engagement**: Increased involvement in, and enjoyment of, school-related activities and relationships.
- **Empowerment**: Belief in one’s ability to determine the course of one’s own life.
- **Civic Engagement**: A sense of social responsibility; a willingness and commitment to act to address needs in one’s community.
- **Personal and Social Development**: Markers of personal growth and maturity, including appreciation of differences, and development of personal responsibility.
- **Leadership & Teamwork Skills**: The skills necessary to plan projects and organize resources to implement them.
- **Expanded Awareness of Social Issues**: The ability to recognize and understand issues of social concern, locally and globally.
- **Agency**: Belief in one’s ability to effect change in the world.
- **Empathy & Compassion**: Willingness and desire to understand and value others’ experiences.
- **Expanded Sense of Possibility**: Belief that the world can be a better place for oneself and others.
- **Self-Worth**: Belief that one is worthy of esteem or respect.

Based on the activities, assumptions, and outcomes identified through the collaborative process described above, the Heller team developed the following statement of buildOn’s Theory of Change:

*buildOn transforms youth into powerful agents of change in their communities by providing them with the opportunity to: become aware of social issues and needs locally and globally; recognize their own power in acting to meet those needs; and develop the leadership, teamwork, planning, and fundraising skills necessary for a lifetime of commitment to service. As they experience their own power to make change both locally and globally, youth begin to see expanded possibilities not only for their own lives, but for a better world.*

The activities, outcomes, and assumptions and impact were outlined in a logic model (a visual representation of the TOC). A logic model is a commonly used framework for program planning and evaluation, as it illustrates the components of an organization’s TOC. A copy of the collaborative logic model can be found in Appendix A. While there are many forms the logic model can take, depending on which element of the model an organization wants to emphasize, the Heller team chose a model that emphasizes assumptions. This fit best with the idea of the TOC as a tool for developing an impact evaluation, since such an evaluation rests on measuring and evaluating how well the program activities are leading to the desired outcomes.
**Previous Logic Model & Theory of Change**

buildOn previously had a logic model and TOC, which the Heller team reviewed as one of many internal documents provided by the organization. The team decided to develop a new TOC, since the TOC can take many forms, and the earlier version did not address the most important points from an impact evaluation perspective. It was heavily output-oriented, and focused on forecasting the impact buildOn might have at an organizational level. In addition, the original buildOn logic model presented program activities and outcomes, but lacked the assumptions that drive the desired outcomes.

The TOC and logic model produced by the Heller team was developed with the particular aim of evaluating of the program’s current outcomes. As buildOn’s program model and evaluation needs evolve, buildOn may wish to revisit both the content and format of these two tools, so that they are consistent with the organization’s desired program outcomes.

**Analysis of Comparable Organizations**

Once outcomes had been clarified, the team focused its efforts on finding appropriate comparable organizations and evaluations. Researching evaluation practices of eight comparable youth development organizations helped to frame the team’s recommendations for buildOn’s new evaluation system. The team researched the following organizations:

- City Year
- Earth Force
- Friends of the Children NY
- Room to Read (RtR)
- Summer of Service
- Summer Search
- Upward Bound
- YouthBuild

A detailed matrix with information on comparable organizations – including information such as mission, target client, locations of operation, program model and evaluation techniques – can be found in Appendix H. With the exception of RtR, all of the comparable organizations are U.S.-based and incorporate components of community service, civic engagement, mentoring, or academic enrichment in their programming. Although it has a small U.S.-based school component, RtR primarily builds libraries for schools in developing countries.

**Evaluation Techniques**

The majority of these organizations – City Year, Earth Force, RtR, Summer Search, Upward Bound – use pre- and post-surveys at a minimum. City Year, RtR, and Summer Search use additional techniques throughout the school year, such as focus groups,
direct observation, and interviews with key stakeholders. To gain specific academic performance and achievement measures, City Year, Upward Bound, and Friends of the Children incorporate transcripts or school student data into their evaluations. City Year’s “Diploma’s Now” program, which focuses on mentoring middle school students who have demonstrated early warning indicators of dropping out high school, specifically tracks attendance rates, school behavior problems, and students’ grades in math and English (City Year, “Diplomas Now,” 2010).

Staff Allocation

While the amount of available information on staffing varied by comparable organization, the majority of these groups seem to either employ full-time evaluation staff, or have used an outside evaluator within the past five years.

- City Year has a team of four evaluation staff at its headquarters, while RtR has two evaluation staff members at its headquarters and one staff member in each of the six Asian countries where it works.
- Summer Search has a full-time Program Quality Officer to support quality mentoring and to ensure consistent data-entry and analysis of student and mentor performance.
- Earth Force is the apparent exception, without any staff members expressly dedicated to evaluation.

Outside Consultants and Long-term Evaluations

For longer evaluations, most of the comparable organizations chose to use an outside evaluator. Many such evaluations include longitudinal studies that span multiple years. The value of contracting with an outside evaluator for longer-term evaluations is that it can free up staff time, as well as provide additional credibility to findings.

- Summer Search used See Change Evaluation for its 2005-2010 longitudinal, quasi-experimental study, while Boston Consulting Group (BCG) provided a pro-bono evaluation of Summer Search in 2006.
- Policy Studies Associates conducted a wide-scale impact assessment of City Year’s program that included surveying alumni over a period of four years.
- Researchers from Claremont Graduate University and Stanford University evaluated four of RtR’s country programs in 2005 using a 66-question survey that was administered by independent, professional interviewers. Survey participants were selected using random, representative sampling. At present, RtR does not conduct evaluations using a control group, but is planning a multi-country, longitudinal evaluation of its Reading Room program that will include a control group.
- Upward Bound conducted a longitudinal evaluation through Mathematica Policy Research. Mathematica’s first survey in 1999 assessed students from a nationally representative sample of 67 program sites. A second survey in 2004 served as a three-year follow up.
Information on YouthBuild’s evaluation practices comes from a 2004 study by Brandeis University and Temple University. The evaluation used a 15-page mailed survey, which received 882 responses, and in-depth interviews of 57 YouthBuild alumni at eight sites across the country. Interviewees were selected to represent the demographics of the sites they attended. The interview protocol was first reviewed by a separate group of YouthBuild participants who were not involved in the evaluation, and was designed to cover the same areas as the survey questions.

Data Analysis
While not all of the comparable organizations used rigorous statistical standards, most incorporated at least some statistical practices – whether measuring survey results in terms of statistical significance, or using random sampling to achieve a representative sample.

Presentation of Data
There are several ways that comparable organizations present evaluation results to reflect program impact. Earth Force, for example, reports its survey results in terms of “percentage of students reporting improvement” in each outcome category, as opposed to the percentage change in the average score for each outcome category.

Public Presentation of Evaluation Results/Findings
A valuable component of the evaluation process is sharing evaluation results with stakeholders, both internal and external to the organization. Many of the comparable organizations – City Year, Earth Force, RtR, Upward Bound – have pages on their websites showcasing evaluation results and/or including links for evaluation reports to be downloaded. The comparable organizations specifically share evaluation information in the following ways:

- City Year has a “research page” on its website featuring the results of recent evaluations, such as evidence that its program has a long-term impact on participants the following areas: voting, volunteering, leadership, diversity, civic involvement, membership, and education achievement. Evaluation reports are available for downloading, and can serve as excellent resources for program evaluation models.
- Earth Force has an evaluation webpage highlighting the program's civic and environmental outcomes, as well as its participants’ positive experiences in the program.
- RtR provides its evaluation reports for downloading, and has an entire “Frequently Asked Questions” webpage dedicated to monitoring and evaluation issues. Examples of questions include, “How have you used Monitoring & Evaluation to improve your programs?” and, "Do you conduct pre- and post-tests to measure program impact?"
• Only YouthBuild does not provide extensive information on evaluation on its website. However, the website does list information on “outcomes” – i.e., the percentage of participants who complete the program, the percentage of participants who transition to jobs or further education after the program, their average wage in these jobs, etc.
• Summer Search frequently features statistics and graphs about evaluation outcomes in its annual reports. For example, in its 2006 annual report, Summer Search cited several of the Boston Consulting Group’s (BCG) evaluation findings: "Children of Summer Search college graduates will be 90% more likely to attend college," "Summer Search college graduates will earn close to $1 million and pay $220,000 in additional taxes over their lifetimes.” Summer Search also quantifies its return on investment: “Every dollar you invest in a Summer Search student yields a $24 rate of return.” This is calculated by comparing the future earnings of students as college graduates, and additional scholarships earned, with the cost per student over the lifetime of the Summer Search program (J. Yang, personal communication, August 13, 2010).

Evaluation Option Methods

In order to recommend the optimal evaluation choices for buildOn, the Heller team researched commonly used data collection techniques for evaluation. Among the numerous evaluation options available, the following methodologies were identified as appropriate:

• Questionnaires/surveys
• Focus group discussions
• Key informant interviews
• Comparison group studies (quasi-experimental)

Other evaluation techniques, such as cost-benefit analysis, were excluded early on due to their lack of relevance for buildOn’s research question (i.e., the impact of the afterschool program).

Questionnaires/Surveys

Questionnaires/surveys can be implemented most easily in terms of cost and time required. Pre- and post-surveys are used in this method, or post-surveys only. Pre-surveys are administered prior to participants becoming involved in program activities (or right at the beginning), while post-surveys are administered afterwards. Using both pre- and post-surveys provides “baseline” data against which performance can be compared. Surveys can be administered via mail, telephone, over the internet, in face-to-face interviews, or in a group (World Bank, 2004; Innovation Center for Community & Youth Development, 2005).

Surveys have a low time investment if designed ahead of time – as is the case for buildOn, since the proposed survey is included with this report in Appendices L and M.
The remaining time will be spent on administering the (pre- and post-) surveys, and on processing survey results. For data processing, buildOn has the option to simply assess the results according to the percentages of students who respond positively to the outcomes measured, or to apply methods of statistical analysis. Statistical analysis would be used, for example, to assess whether the change in students’ attitudes measured by the pre- and post-surveys is statistically significant. For this level of analysis, a tool such as Stata or SPSS would be useful. A web-based survey tool, such as SurveyMonkey, can administer a survey electronically and provide tools for analysis of results.

**Focus group discussions**

Focus group discussions can add a layer of qualitative analysis to questionnaires/surveys, even though focus groups require additional time and skills on the part of the evaluation administrator. In a focus group, the administrator leads a facilitated discussion among six to 12 carefully selected participants about a clearly defined topic. Note-takers record comments and observations. In some cases, focus group information is compared with the opinions of key informants and information from questionnaires/surveys (World Bank, 2004; Innovation Center for Community & Youth Development, 2005).

Focus groups have the added benefit of allowing participants to validate or qualify information received via surveys. The downside is that unless focus group participants are specifically designed to be a representative sample of the entire program, then the results may be skewed towards the particular community in which the focus group was conducted.

Additionally, focus group administrators must be trained in non-directive group facilitation, interviewing, observation, and note-taking skills. After the focus groups have been completed, the information gathered must be sorted by themes, and analyzed in order to interpret the themes’ significance.

**Key Informant Interviews**

Key informant interviews may be less costly than focus groups, because they rely on one-on-one interactions between an evaluator and the interviewee. In this methodology, an evaluator poses a series of open-ended questions to individuals selected for their knowledge and experience in a topic of interest. In the case of buildOn, key informants could include teachers, youth participants, agency staff, parents, and even funders. Interviews should be semi-structured and based on pre-determined interview guides that list the topics and questions.

Many of the same advantages and disadvantages of focus groups apply to key informant interviews. The difference between the techniques lies in the way the interactions are structured – i.e., a group setting vs. a one-on-one setting.
One advantage of key informant interviews is that they can provide information about program impact on participants’ knowledge, behavior, or attitudes that the participants themselves may not have noticed. For instance, a teacher may notice that a student has a better attitude in class.

**Comparison Group Study**

The most rigorous methodology for measuring impact involves evaluating the participants alongside a comparison group that has not participated in the program. The comparison group should match the characteristics of the program group as closely as possible (World Bank, 2004; Innovation Center for Community & Youth Development, 2005). The evaluation can then take the format of questionnaires, focus groups, or interviews.

The advantage to conducting a comparison group-based evaluation is that it is the most scientifically sound way to assess whether the program has, in fact, created the intended impact on participants. However, the challenge of this approach is that identifying a comparison group adds a layer of complexity and time necessary to set up the evaluation.

The following are some examples of comparable organizations that have used a comparison group:

- The National Institutes for Health conducted a two-year study on Friends of the Children, funded by the New York Life Foundation, which compared a group of mentored students against a control group of students on a range of social, educational, and developmental milestones.
- In its 2005-2010 longitudinal study, Summer Search compared outcomes of students who persisted in the program with students that Summer Search didn’t accept, or who dropped out of the program.

**Analysis of Donor Trends in Education**

The comparable organizations listed above face many of the same evaluation challenges as buildOn. One of the primary challenges is how to produce the results demanded by a new type of donor.

buildOn’s current funding mix is primarily foundations and corporations (39%) and individuals (25%) (buildOn, 2008). However, as the organization moves to diversify funding and seeks increasing support from foundations and government agencies, its evaluation strategy must likewise evolve.

The major trend in the donor landscape is toward a demand for more evidence-based programming. With over 1,000,000 registered public charities in the United States as of January 2010 (National Center for Charitable Statistics), donors are becoming more discriminating in how they channel their limited resources. No longer satisfied with
anecdotal evidence of program success, they are increasingly looking toward quantifiable results (Berger, 2010).

Individuals and corporations – the two main sources of buildOn’s revenue – have typically been less focused on evidence-based outcomes. In a recent study, despite the fact that 85% of individual donors surveyed said that a charity’s performance was very important, only 35% conducted their own research on giving (Preston, 2010). The government agencies and foundations to whom buildOn is increasingly looking for support, however, require more rigorous evidence of impact.

buildOn has identified the Robin Hood Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation as potential funders (C. Peña, personal correspondence, July 19, 2010). Both foundations were founded by “venture philanthropists” – former business people with a strong focus on tracking quantitative results and performance. While the Robin Hood Foundation focuses solely on poverty reduction in New York City and the Gates Foundation supports a range of different initiatives, both organizations share a strong interest in metrics and academics. Both utilize cost-benefit metrics to quantify their return on investment in education initiatives and programs (Robin Hood; Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation).

The Department of Education, another potential funder, also places heavy emphasis on measurement and quantifiable results. The concentration on academic measures is largely a legacy of the 2002 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which created a focus in the education field on accountability and data collection. NCLB focuses on “adequate yearly progress” of schools. Schools must demonstrate progress through standardized test scores and graduation rates in order to receive funding (Education Week, 2004)

The Gates Foundation, the Robin Hood Foundation, and the Department of Education have focused on easily quantifiable measures such as grades and test scores as a way to track progress towards a goal of high school graduation and college readiness. This goal is directed by the ultimate aim of improving students’ lifetime earnings potential, as a poverty reduction strategy, and as a method to create a strong future national workforce and economy. It is important to point out that this goal differs from that which is currently supported by buildOn’s program model, which is to create empowered change agents.

A discussion of donor trends must underline that donor trends are just that – trends. The missions and causes that donors financially support at any given time are influenced by the latest reports and theories on solutions to social problems. The research behind these reports is financed by whatever social issue is “hot” at the moment and receiving research funding. An example relevant to the education field is the Gates Foundation, which plans in the next five to seven years to spend $3 billion on education. In 2005, research that showed small school were overrepresented among high achievers led the Gates Foundation to fund efforts to create small high schools and divide up larger schools. The research behind that data has since been questioned, and in 2008 the Gates Foundation publicly acknowledged that the efforts weren’t working.
Based on new research that highlights the importance of teacher quality in student performance, Gates is now focusing on efforts that reward teachers with bonuses based on increases in students’ standardized test scores and observation of student improvement (Bloomberg, BusinessWeek, 2010).

While donors have recently placed heavy emphasis on academic metrics, it is important to mention the ongoing debate over whether metrics are the best way of measuring and predicting student success. A study of Oregon students showed that on average, students with high adequate yearly progress (AYP) under NCLB had lower first-term GPAs and lower one-year retention rates than graduates of high school that did not meet AYP (Aldeman, 2010). In his book *The Global Achievement Gap*, Wagner argues that the focus on standardized tests doesn’t prepare students with the core competencies – problem solving and critical thinking, collaboration across networks, adaptability, initiative, effective oral and written communication, analyzing information, and developing curiosity and imagination – necessary for success in college and the 21st century workforce (Wagner, 2008). As further research develops over time on the validity of academic metrics as indicators of success, donor interest may also shift.

These donor trends in the education field have significant implications for buildOn’s evaluation strategies. As donors increasingly ask for metrics-based, academic results, buildOn must adapt in order to qualify for funding from these sources. Our recommendations for measuring academic outcomes reflect these implications.

An informational scan sheet on donor trends and their implication for buildOn can be found in Appendix Q.

**A Focus on Academic Achievement**

buildOn’s management challenge proposal specifically asked the Heller team to look at program impact on academic achievement. The challenge stated that from firsthand experience and anecdotal information, buildOn believes a correlation exists between program engagement over time and GPA, test scores, etc. As noted above, foundation and other major funders are increasingly interested in metrics of academic achievement. Furthermore, buildOn’s original MIES fell into disuse because it did not address buildOn’s growing interest in measuring academic outcomes.

As such, the Heller team made academic achievement a priority in its research, identifying the most common indicators of academic achievement used by donors and comparable organizations, and how they could be collected by buildOn. Additionally, with the 10 identified outcomes of buildOn’s afterschool program, the consulting team researched studies that link many of these outcomes to academic achievement.
Common indicators of academic achievement

The Heller team compiled a snapshot of the landscape of academic metrics by considering the measures of academic achievement collected by funders as well as by comparable organizations. (See Table 1 below.)

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In High School:</th>
<th>After High School:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Grades/GPA</td>
<td>• Graduation rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standardized test scores</td>
<td>• College matriculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● National: SAT, ACT, AP</td>
<td>• College graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● State specific subject and grade level tests - ex. New York Regents subject tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grade promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Robin Hood Foundation

Robin Hood's education grants fund charter schools, mentoring organizations, and a number of other organizations focused on high-risk youth. Robin Hood evaluates grants to such organizations based on the following metrics: standardized test scores, grades, absenteeism, and grade repetition (Robin Hood, 2009).

Department of Education

Under NCLB, schools are required to meet state-defined “adequate yearly progress” (AYP). Scores on assessment tests determine this progress. In the nearly ten years since NCLB went into effect, states have improved the data they collect. Some states have started tracking students into college, looking at measures such as one-year retention rates, college remediation needs, and college GPA. The states of Kentucky and Missouri track college graduation by the high school the students attended. Florida goes so far as to track earnings data (Aldeman, 2010).

Gates Foundation

Under the “Intensive Partnerships for Effective Teaching” initiative that rewards effective teachers, teachers are graded 40% on student gains as measured by standardized test scores, and 60% on observations by school principals and other teachers in the school district (Bloomberg, BusinessWeek, 2010)
Comparable Organizations

Friends of the Children NY, a Robin Hood grantee, uses an outside evaluator to analyze student transcripts by focusing on standardized testing, attendance, grade promotion, and specialized tests like the Regents Exam. They also administer nationally normed achievement tests for K-12 once a year. Summer Search tracks high school graduation rates, college matriculation, and whether students are on track to graduate college.

Methods of Collecting Academic Achievement Measures

The literature review and conversations with comparable organizations revealed that there are a variety of approaches to collecting academic measures. Student transcripts serve as a primary source for these measures.

Obtaining Transcripts from the School District

If an organization wants to obtain transcripts from a school district, they must apply through the district’s Institutional Review Board and demonstrate that the research will be beneficial to the district and the schools (E. Moldow, Center for Youth and Communities; personal communication; August 12, 2010; T. Piñeros-Shields, Center for Youth and Communities; personal communication; August 12, 2010).

The application process varies from district to district. For instance, Chicago Public Schools (CPS) requires eight copies of the multi-page research proposal to be submitted 60 days prior to the start of the research project. There is also a $50 application processing fee (Chicago Public Schools, 2008). The process may last months, especially if the district initially rejects the application.

Each school district has its own policies, usually posted online, about what it will allow from outside researchers. For example, CPS does not allow researchers to request data directly from the schools. The New York City Department of Education allows authorized researchers to collect and analyze transcript information, but it must be presented in the aggregate (R. Houck, Friends of the Children NY; personal communication; August 13, 2010).

Obtaining Transcripts from High Schools

buildOn could consider reaching out to the schools directly to obtain transcript information about the students. However, in order to release the transcripts, most schools would still need written permission from the school district (Moldow, 2010) as well as a signed release from students’ parents. buildOn’s one attempt in 2010 to measure academic success by collecting transcript information for LEAD students illustrates many of the challenges inherent to this process and described here.

Obtaining Transcripts from Students

Obtaining transcripts directly from the students is the easiest method. One option is to have students self-report their grades. Another option is to ask students to agree to
share their grades/transcripts as part of their participation in the program. In one instance, one youth program had students bring copies of their latest report card, along with a signed permission slip for the use of its data, as one of the required documents for attending a trip. However, unlike buildOn, this particular program used grade tracking to target its participants’ academic weaknesses and set up a plan for tutoring in that area (A. Melchior, Center for Youth and Communities; personal communication; August 12, 2010).

**Obtaining Information Post-High School**

The National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) partners with 3,300 colleges that enroll 92% of U.S. college students. The NSC has a “Student Tracker for Outreach Programs,” a web-based service that costs $425/year and allows outreach programs to track information such as where former program participants enrolled/graduated from college, as well as their college major (National Student Clearinghouse). Several organizations, including Summer Search, use the NSC to supplement data collected from calling alumni and working with school guidance counselors.

**Anticipated Challenges in Analyzing Transcripts**

One of the challenges in collecting transcripts is that grading policies among schools differ, including the policies by which GPAs are determined. For example, one high school may grade on a 5.0 scale, where an “A” grade in an Advanced Placement (AP) course would grant the student a 5.0 in the class, while another high school may give a 4.0 for an “A” in an AP course. Also, student grades are widely considered an unreliable measure of student success because grading is viewed as subjective. Teacher X may not grade the same student the same way as Teacher Y.

The majority of buildOn participants self-report that they do well academically. Results from the year-end 2010-2009 Student Survey show that 51% of respondents self-report as receiving “A’s,” and 34.8% as “B’s.” The fact that so many of buildOn’s members are already doing well academically means that any positive changes in grades will be incremental and thus more difficult to measure and/or attribute solely to involvement with buildOn.

School districts also vary in the way in which they calculate graduation rates. As such, if buildOn were to choose this indicator as its preferred measure of academic success, it would need to choose a consistent definition of graduation rate.

**Academic Engagement**

The Heller team identified academic engagement as an outcome of buildOn’s programming. While academic engagement is not the same as academic achievement, studies have suggested a correlation between engagement and improved academic achievement.
Academic engagement can be classified into three categories: behavioral, emotional, and cognitive. Behavioral engagement can be exhibited and measured through indicators such as class participation, positive conduct, and increased involvement in extracurricular activities. Emotional engagement is affective reactions, both in the classroom (interest, boredom, etc.) and to the school or teacher. Examples include feeling safe at school and feeling engaged with other students and teachers (Russell et al, 2010). Emotional engagement can be measured through agree or disagree survey questions such as, “My teachers make me feel my schoolwork is important” and “It is very important to me to do the best I can in school” (SOS, 2010; Gallup, 2009).

Academic engagement has been show to correlate with academic achievement as measured by grades, test scores, etc. Behavioral engagement – completing homework, participating in class discussion – has been shown to strongly correlate with academic achievement. Emotional engagement, such as enjoying coming to school, has also been shown to correlate with academic achievement. Disengagement from school and achievement are significantly negatively correlated. Race plays a role in engagement; African-American students show a stronger association between achievement and disengagement (Sbrocco, 2009). Given that 35% of buildOn students surveyed in 2010 self-reported as African-American or Black (buildOn, “Student Survey, 2010”), buildOn’s efforts to engage students academically could have an above-average effect on academic performance.

**Links Between buildOn Outcomes and Academic Achievement**

Extensive research exists on the academic links between buildOn outcomes and activities – specifically academic engagement, hope, community service, and mentoring – and academic achievement.

**Hope and Academic Achievement**

Research shows that attendance and credits earned (Gallup, 2009b) and academic achievement is consistently linked to hope (Mello, 2001). Hopeful high school students have higher overall grade point averages (Gallup, 2009a; Snyder, Harris, et al., 1991; Worrell & Hale, 2001). Even when controlling for prior grades (Snyder, Harris, et al., 1991; Snyder et al., 2002), hope remained significant. In a study of college students, GPA and hours of studying per week were positively related to future orientation.

The annual Gallup Student Poll measures the hope, engagement and well-being of students in grades 5-12 across the United States. Findings from the March 2009 Gallup student poll found that hope varies little across grade levels and that the percentage of students on free and reduced lunch was not associated with hope (Lopez, 2009). This is significant given that, according to the buildOn 2010 Student Survey, 50.5% of respondents receive free lunch and 11.3% receive reduced lunch (2010 Student Survey).
Service Learning/Community Service and Academic Achievement

A variety of studies have demonstrated a correlation between service learning and community service and academic engagement (RMC Research Corporation, 2007). A review of data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS) showed that civic engagement activities raised the probability of graduation and improved high school students’ progress in reading, math, science and history (Dávila & Mora, 2007).

Low socio-economic students (SES) who participated in community service scored better on most academic success variables than their high socio-economic peers who had less or no service experience. Furthermore, although low SES students generally report lower grades than high SES students in high school, low SES students who engaged in service appeared to do as well or better than high SES students who did not engage in service (Scales, 2005). (The Heller team recommends buildOn look specifically at Table 2 of this report.)

Mentoring and Academic Achievement

Research has shown mentoring to have a positive effect both directly on academic achievement, and indirectly by improving other aspects of positive youth development that contribute to academic outcomes. Mentoring contributes to improvements in social-emotional development, cognitive development (including school engagement and academic achievement), and identity development (Rhodes et al 2006).

Mentoring has also shown positive effect on college attendance. A study showed that for all teenage students, having an adult mentor meant a 50 percent greater likelihood of attending college (Brigham Young University, 2009).

Conclusion

These results – including the theory of change, identified program outcomes, types of evaluation techniques used by comparable organizations, and donor and leadership interest in academic metrics – have informed the Heller team’s recommendations for buildOn. The next section will provide detail recommendations on implementation of the impact evaluation framework and suggestions for moving towards becoming a more impact and results-oriented organization.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Measuring Academic Achievement

STEP 1: Focus on the Link Between Core Competencies and Academic Achievement

Donors’ growing interest in academic achievement outcomes suggests that buildOn needs a way to begin showing how its program contributes to academic achievement. The Heller team recommends that as a first step, buildOn highlight the literature linking buildOn’s core competencies with academic achievement.

Some of buildOn’s current grants and marketing efforts focus on the positive outcomes of afterschool programs in general. However, buildOn is not a generic afterschool program. buildOn has a highly distinctive program model, with core competencies in community service, global education, and mentoring.

buildOn should highlight the connections between these specific strengths and its program outcomes using the literature that links these outcomes and activities to academic achievement. For example, buildOn has a core competency in mentoring. Students consistently expressed the meaningful relationship they have with their
program coordinators (PCs). As discussed in the results section, “The Links Between buildOn Outcomes and Academic Achievement,” several research studies link mentoring with outcomes of improved academic achievement. The Heller team recommends buildOn elaborate on this research and highlight it in grants and marketing/fundraising appeals.

**STEP 2: Pilot Collecting Transcripts**

buildOn believes there may be a correlation between involvement in its afterschool program over time and GPA, test scores, etc. The Heller team identified academic engagement, mentoring and hope as buildOn outcomes, and found evidence in the literature to support a causal link between these outcomes and improved academic achievement. The next step towards exploring if these outcomes lead to improved academics is to begin collecting and analyzing transcripts. The Heller team recommends that buildOn experiment with collecting student transcripts on a smaller-scale pilot basis. The reasons for this pilot basis are twofold:

1) Logistical Difficulties: Given the difficulty in obtaining transcripts from either the schools or the school districts, it is advisable for buildOn to limit the number of schools it uses in the sample size for measuring academic achievement. The Heller team recommends starting with one region in which students self-reported a lower GPA and one region in which students self-reported a higher GPA. buildOn should start in regions where it only has to work with the administration of one school district, such as Chicago, to limit bureaucratic difficulties.

2) Uncertainty of Results: The question remains as to whether the results will be worth the additional staff time and resources necessary to collect transcripts. As mentioned previously, buildOn students self-report high grades. Will their transcripts show significant increases in grades or standardized test scores? Additionally, it will take at least a year of data collection to be able to analyze changes in metrics across marking periods. There is the possibility that donor interest may shift away academic metrics in the time it takes for buildOn to invest in an academic tracking system.

*How to Collect Transcripts*

Parental permission to collect transcripts should be built into the existing parent waiver sent out at the onset of participation in the program. Permission to collect transcripts from the schools should be built into the covenants with the schools (and districts). Setting the expectation ahead of time should ease access to acquiring academic information from the schools. buildOn could make the case that it is in the
district’s best interest to learn whether the buildOn program is helping with student achievement, as this is of great importance to the schools due to No Child Left Behind.

**What to Analyze**

Since grades are sometimes considered an unreliable measure of academic performance, due to subjectivity in grading and variations across schools in levels of academic rigor, buildOn should focus on analyzing improvements in metrics such as attendance, grade promotion, and national standardized test scores. These metrics can be used to calculate changes over time for individual students involved in the program, as well as to compare buildOn students to regional and national averages.

If buildOn would like to combine the results of the academic achievement data with impact survey data, it would need to use the same identifying markers, such as birthday, gender, and initials.

**STEP 3: Tracking Alumni**

The Heller team also recommends that buildOn begin tracking academic metrics of its alumni, in much the same way that Summer Search does. The team recommends that buildOn track high school graduation rates, college matriculation and college graduation rates. buildOn could then compare these rates to the national rates, or to rates in particular regions.

buildOn could obtain high school graduation rates from school transcripts. Due to the variation in the way that schools measure graduation rates, buildOn should compare the graduation rates of its participants either a) to national graduation rates, or b) to the graduation rates within the particular region the participant comes from.

The post-survey that the team is providing asks, “Do you plan to attend college?” It also asks students which college they plan to attend, to enhance the validity of self-reporting. Once each regional office collects baseline data on which students are attending college, staff can keep in touch with alumni using follow-up surveys. To encourage response rates, buildOn should provide incentives for completing the survey (such as the chance to win a gift card). Other incentives for alumni to stay in touch include: allowing alumni to apply for staffing positions on the Trek for Knowledge, inviting alumni to the end-of-year celebrations or other special events, and summer internships for college students.

Additionally, buildOn could track college matriculation and graduation rates using alumni’s college transcripts (with alumni’s consent). Transcripts are available through
the National Student Clearinghouse for the cost of $7 - $8 per transcript. However, this service is only available at participating universities (of which there are many – but the list is not exhaustive).

To facilitate alumni tracking, PCs should collect graduating seniors’ email addresses. Evaluation professionals also recommend collecting other contact information on current program participants (address and phone number(s) of parents/guardians) so that it is possible to follow up indirectly if alumni cannot be reached directly. The proliferation of social media sites, such as Facebook, should assist with staying in contact with students, especially since students change addresses frequently after high school graduation.

**Impact Evaluation: Short-Term**

Based on a review of comparable organizations’ evaluation practices (refer to Appendix H), the Heller team recommends that buildOn proceeds with the following sequence for short-term evaluation:

- Step 1: Pre- and Post-surveys
- Step 2: Focus Groups, Pre- and Post-surveys
- Step 3: Key Informant Interviews, Focus Groups, Pre- and Post-surveys
- Step 4: Comparison Group Study, Key Informant Interviews, Focus Groups, Pre-and Post-Surveys

The Heller team has provided a comprehensive framework for using pre- and post-surveys, including an implementation plan (refer to Appendix R).

Where practical considerations limit buildOn’s ability to implement all elements of Step 4, it is recommended that a comparison group study be conducted in conjunction with the pre- and post-surveys.

In reviewing the following options, buildOn should consider the question, “What type of data do we need in order to move the program forward?” The answer to that question may change at different points in the future – but it will provide guidance as to what level of evaluation buildOn should implement.

**Building Organizational Buy-In**

In order to ensure that staff at all levels understand the importance of evaluation and feel willing to participate, buildOn should invest some effort ahead of time in building
organizational buy-in. This is an ongoing process that spans from initially training staff on the value of evaluation, to how to administer the evaluation, to soliciting staff feedback on the evaluation results.

For example, evaluation results should be presented in a participatory manner that allows staff to respond and offer their feedback on the implications of the results for the program. Facilitators should record staff feedback so that buildOn’s leadership can use this information to make decisions on any adjustments to the afterschool program.

buildOn should consider conducting the Theory of Change workshops that the Heller team led with staff and students from the Bronx, so as include staff and students in the evaluation process. The workshops will help frame for staff members the idea of program activities leading to program outcomes, and help all staff members feel in agreement about program outcomes. (The how-to guides for these workshops are available in Appendix C.)

**STEP 1: Pre- and Post-surveys**

*Pre-surveys*

buildOn should immediately start its impact evaluation using pre- and post-surveys. Unlike buildOn’s current practice of administering year-end surveys only, this method will provide baseline data to demonstrate changes in attitudes, knowledge, and behavior.

PCs should distribute the pre-surveys as part of a “Welcome Packet” that all students receive when they first come to a buildOn meeting or event. Welcome Packets should also include permission slips in which parents/guardians give consent to have the students complete the survey. PCs could ensure a high response rate by having a student leader (such as a “New Member” or “Program Evaluation” officer) follow up with new members to encourage them to submit the pre-surveys and permission slips.

This process can be repeated for students as they join (due to buildOn’s open membership model) in Oct., Nov., or Dec. However, evaluation professionals agree that there needs to be a “cut-off point” after which new members can no longer complete the pre-survey, in order to ensure there is an adequate length of time that students have participated before they complete the post survey. The Heller team recommends allowing new members to complete the pre-survey up until the end of the first semester. If other students join the club in the spring semester, they are not required to fill out the pre-survey, and they will also not be given a post-survey, since the purpose
of the post-survey is to compare pre- and post-results. However, the following spring, these students should complete a post-survey, since at that point they will have had an adequate length of time participating in the program.

Even though buildOn doesn’t need students to write their names on the surveys, the surveys must request some identifying factors so that pre- and post-surveys can be matched. Evaluation professionals recommend asking for the following identifying factors:

- Gender
- Birth date, and
- Initials (first initial of your “official” first name, first initial of the last word in your last name -- e.g., Hillary Rodham Clinton becomes “HC,” Bill Clinton becomes “WC,” with W for William) (E. Moldow, 2010; A. Melchior, 2010; T. Piñeros-Shields, 2010).

Since some identifying data will be collected on the pre-surveys (e.g., birthdate, gender, and initials), PCs need to be upfront with the students that these surveys are not anonymous – but they are confidential. Also, no identifying factors about the students will be used when the results are tabulated or reported.

Post-surveys

To ensure a high response rate for the post-surveys, PCs should set aside a dedicated afterschool meeting to conduct the post-surveys – and provide incentives for participation (“service hours to buildOn,” food, or the chance to win gift cards).

Note: There should be provisions within the survey implementation for administering the survey to students who are non-native English speakers. For example, comparable organization RtR overcomes this language barrier by having interviewers administer the survey in another language, where necessary.

Sample Size

The survey doesn’t need to be distributed to all program sites – just to a representative sample. The total number of responses required for the sample size depends on the total size of the program “population.” For example, if buildOn works with 118 schools and there are 25 students involved per school, the “population” size is 2,950.

Using an online sample size calculator recommended by professionals at the Brandeis Center for Youth and Communities (SurveySystem.com, “Sample Size Calculator”) the
Heller team found that buildOn would need a sample size of 340 to 500 participants in order to predict with 95% certainty that the sample is representative of the population. However, because there is frequently “drop off” in the number of pre-test and post-tests responses (i.e., fewer students complete the post-test than the pre-test), it is advisable to increase the pre-survey sample size by 20 - 30% of the recommended sample size. Therefore, buildOn should plan to survey between 425 and 625 students in its pre-survey. The larger the sample size, the more reliable the results.

This sample set of 425 to 625 youth should not be drawn from across all buildOn sites, but rather, should be drawn from a select few representative sites. Representative sites might be chosen according to:

- The availability of the local program staff to commit to a year-long project
- Demographics mirroring the national picture (gender, race/ethnicity, and location)
- Having been in operation for at least two years (i.e., not “new” program sites)

However, if buildOn feels it would be advantageous to have site-specific information (or region-specific information), then the sample set could be based on a particular site or region. For instance, if buildOn wanted to compare the outcomes at the NY region vs. the CT region, they would need to select samples from each of these regions.

For additional information on how to implement Step 1, please refer to Appendix R, “Workplan for Implementation of Evaluation Framework.”

**Tabulating Survey Responses**

Where possible, the Heller team recommends that buildOn participants directly enter their responses into SurveyMonkey. If students complete paper surveys, then someone will need to enter these responses into the SurveyMonkey site.

While it would be simple enough for PCs to tabulate the data from their schools, evaluation professionals agree that there are some risks involved with this method. For instance, PCs who have worked with students throughout the year can frequently recognize their students’ handwriting. Thus, if PCs enter the data from their schools, it is misleading to tell students that their responses are confidential.

Instead, the Heller team recommends that PCs collect the surveys in sealed envelopes and send them either to the regional office or to buildOn headquarters (HQ) in
Stamford. If the surveys are submitted to the regional office, “alternate” PCs (i.e., PCs who do not work at that particular school) could tabulate and analyze the data, as could regional staff members. If the surveys are sent to HQ, a national staff member or graduate student intern could enter the data into SurveyMonkey and analyze the results.

If necessary, there are some data entry services that buildOn could hire to transfer its paper surveys into an Excel file. The Brandeis CYC uses TradeQuotes in Cambridge, MA. TradeQuotes provides data tabulating as well as statistical analysis of survey results.

Analyzing the Results

buildOn has several options for how the survey results could be analyzed. Since the survey is designed using a Likert scale, values can be assigned to each of the responses: Strongly disagree = 1; Disagree = 2; Agree = 3; and Strongly agree = 4.

The “professional” SurveyMonkey account ($19.95/mo. or $200/year) is very useful for working with the survey data and provides several options for data analysis:

- SurveyMonkey reports the “average response” per question, which can be useful if buildOn decides to analyze its results in terms of change in average response (i.e., “civic engagement” rated at 2.0 vs. 3.0) over time. For example, buildOn might report that “participation in the buildOn program caused participants’ civic engagement to increase by 50%.”
- It offers filters by category (e.g., analyzing responses by gender or by grade level).
- Users can download the survey results in Excel format or in “CSV” format – either of which can then be uploaded to a statistical analysis program like SPSS or STATA.
- The “cross-tabulation” feature on SurveyMonkey Pro would allow buildOn to identify a statistical relationship between the number of years in the program (or the number of monthly hours in the program) and a particular category of outcome results.

To compare results over time, buildOn would simply need to create two separate Survey Monkey surveys, download the information in two different Excel spreadsheets, and then combine the data into one spreadsheet.

Another option – which is common among comparable organizations in presenting information to donors – is to analyze the results according to the percentage of
participants who demonstrated a change. This information could be presented by category, for example, “75% of participants show an increase in civic engagement,” etc.

Most comparable organizations use some sort of statistical methods in analyzing survey results. Using a computer program like STATA or SPSS can test the data results for “statistical significance.” When a change in the survey responses are “statistically significant,” this means that there is less than a 5% chance that the change is due to random variation – i.e., it is very certain that the change is due to the program.

To determine the statistical significance of the change in scoring, buildOn could use SPSS or STATA to run a T-test. These computer programs may be available through GE. If there aren’t buildOn staff who are familiar with statistics, a graduate student intern could run the statistical analysis.

**STEP 2: Focus Groups, in Combination with Pre- and Post-Surveys**

*Qualitative Data: “The Story Behind the Results”*

Using qualitative data gathered through focus groups can help buildOn to understand “the story behind the results” – i.e., *why* the program is or is not producing desired outcomes, *why* youth are answering the survey questions in a particular manner, and *what* program weaknesses or challenges are preventing participants from reaching the outcome goals (Harvard Family Research Project, 2006).

*Focus Groups*

Focus groups could be conducted at the end of the school year. Ideally, focus groups should be conducted by a staff member other than the PC who working in that school, in order to minimize bias; however, where necessary, the focus groups can be facilitated by PCs for the purpose of ease of implementation.

This does not mean that the PCs shouldn’t be involved in planning the sessions. For example, PCs could work together to brainstorm the focus group questions. The more that PCs and staff who work with the participants are involved in planning the evaluation, the more they will feel ownership in the process. buildOn should also solicit student feedback ahead of time on the focus group questions, and make sure that these questions are aligned with the survey questions.

There should be a time separation of at least a few days in between the focus groups and when the surveys are administered. This is because program participants may hear
other students’ answers during the focus groups, and this could influence their survey responses. Alternatively, the surveys could be administered prior to the focus groups.

**STEP 3: Key Informant Interviews, in Combination with Focus Groups and Pre- and Post-Surveys**

For its Key Informant Interviews, buildOn should conduct interviews with stakeholders such as teachers, guidance counselors, parents/guardians, or the staff of agencies at which students volunteer. The purpose of this qualitative evaluation is to highlight personal changes in the youth that they themselves may not have noticed – but that other adults in their lives have noticed.

Teachers could help elaborate on increased academic engagement – e.g., that particular students are participating more in class, or are more engaged in schoolwork. Guidance counselors could talk about students’ reduced delinquency. Parents/guardians may have noticed that their children are happier at school or have an expanded peer network.

**STEP 4: Comparison Group Study, in Combination with Key Informant Interviews, Focus Groups and Pre- and Post-Surveys**

For Step 4, the Heller team recommends a comparison study with students who came to one meeting (or event) and didn’t come back. These students should be informed that buildOn is requesting their participation in a service to the program, to better understand the attitudes and behaviors of students who choose to participate or not participate in the buildOn program.

Students in the comparison group should complete the pre- and post-surveys, just like buildOn participants. Incentives such as gift cards could be provided to comparison group students to encourage them to come back for the post-survey. This is well within the ethical boundaries of evaluation.

Due to the time-intensive nature of following up with students who are not actively engaged in the program, the team recommends having a dedicated individual working on a Level 4 evaluation, such as a PhD. student or buildOn staff member hired to specialize in evaluation. **Note:** There are foundation grants explicitly for program evaluation.
III. Impact Evaluation: Long-Term

As buildOn’s evaluation needs evolve and the organization is able to dedicate more resources towards evaluation, buildOn should consider implementing the following long-term evaluation steps.

STEP 1: Survey and Focus Groups with Alumni

The impact of participating in buildOn in terms of empowerment or civic engagement may not become apparent to program participants until after they have had a few years to reflect. The value of hindsight is that an alumnus may be better able to pinpoint how buildOn contributed to who he/she is today, and the choices he/she has made.

Therefore, the Heller team recommends that buildOn conduct a survey and focus groups with alumni 2-3 years after these young people have graduated from high school. Instructions for how to conduct a survey or a focus group appear above, in the section on “Impact Evaluation: Short-Term.” The post-survey designed by the Heller team is a suitable starting-off point for the alumni survey, although buildOn may add other, long-term oriented questions on college volunteerism, choice of major, and career choice.

Refer to “Step 3: Tracking Alumni” for recommendations on how to keep in touch with alumni.

STEP 2: Longitudinal Study with Alumni

A longitudinal study refers to surveying or interviewing alumni at multiple points in time over several years – usually a five-year period. buildOn's evaluation could be based on City Year’s “Longitudinal Study of Alumni,” which used longer, open-ended telephone interviews with a sample of recent alumni and a matched sample of non-participants. City Year conducted the interviews twice over the course of the four-year study.

The Heller team recommends that buildOn engage an external evaluator for a longitudinal study. Ideas for low-cost outside evaluators include:

- Boston Consulting Group (which did a pro-bono evaluation for Summer Search)
- PhD. Student

buildOn could also apply for external funding to pay for an external evaluator, such as:
- Innovations for Poverty Action
- See Change Evaluation – the external evaluator used by Summer Search

Harnessing the Benefits of Evaluation

Sharing Evaluation Results

Evaluation results should be presented and communicated according to the particular audience: buildOn staff, program participants, funders or potential funders, parents, potential program participants, etc.

Generally speaking, buildOn should feature the “headlines” of its evaluation results on its website. If it chooses to summarize the evaluation results in report format, this report should be available for download via the website. buildOn can also publicize evaluation results in its annual reports, particularly in graphic format that make a visual impact for the read. For example, refer to Summer Search 2006, 2009.

When reporting on evaluation results, buildOn may find it helpful to compare its program’s outcomes with some of the findings from national data, for instance:

- National Civic Engagement Study by the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) (CIRCLE, “National Youth Survey, 2004”) – which City Year used in its Alumni Cohort Study
- National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88), downloadable from the Department of Education website
- Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS), also downloadable from the Dept. of Ed. website
- Information from the Corporation for National and Community Service
- Any studies available on the National Service Learning Clearinghouse website
- Gallup nation-wide data about hope, engagement, and well-being among high school students.

Local data (such as by state or by region) may also be helpful when putting results into context at the state or regional level – for example, New York State high school graduation rates, or a civic engagement study of a particular school district.

For additional information on how to share evaluation results, please refer to Appendix R, “Workplan for Implementation of Evaluation Framework.”
Going Forward: Addressing Strategic Questions for the Organization

The growing donor interest in outcomes of academic achievement raises important strategic question for buildOn. Under the current program model, activities are not designed to explicitly lead to improved academic achievement, although these activities do lead to observed outcomes of academic engagement, as well as hope and other outcomes that have been linked through research to academic achievement.

As buildOn moves forward with evaluation, it must continually consider what the ultimate impact is that buildOn aims to have on students, as well as identify activities and outcomes support the intended program goals. buildOn must consider both its existing program model and core competencies, as well as current donor trends towards academic achievement, in order to decide if academic success is a desired outcome.

If academic success is a desired outcome, it raises several other strategic questions. First, should program activities be redesigned to actively promote positive academic outcomes? Second, will buildOn need to strategically engage lower performing students? As it stands, the strong academic profile of buildOn students leaves little room for academic improvement. Should buildOn move towards actively engaging more of LEAD-profile students? This would require changes in program curriculum as well as staffing.

The answers to these questions are outside the scope of the Heller team’s research. However, they pose significant implications for buildOn’s future programming and evaluation model. As other strategic questions are bound to arise from the data produced by the evaluation tools, this report will address lastly how buildOn might use the tools included to guide the organization through the process of answering such questions.
As a final recommendation, the Heller team urges buildOn to make evaluation an organizational priority and a fully integrated part of a continuous cycle of program improvement. The most useful tool in this regard is the Theory of Change.

By putting the evaluation tools recommended above into use, buildOn will gather data that can inform discussion and analysis of whether and how well the program activities are producing the desired outcomes. Through this process, buildOn may discover a need to revisit and revise program activities, assumptions, or outcomes; it is at this point that the Theory of Change exercise can play an important role by allowing all staff to be involved in a discussion of, and reach understanding on, the links between their day-to-day activities and the desired outcomes.

Organizational clarity on program outcomes is crucial because, as Vice President of U.S. Programs Abby Hurst told staff, “We need to hold program outcomes in the forefront of our minds as we make choices about our work.” While the differing roles and interests of stakeholders with whom buildOn works may require buildOn staff to at times
emphasize certain of those outcomes more than others, it is vital that every member of the organization understand and support the full set of desired outcomes.

Having worked with the staff over the course of this project, and having seen their dedication to their work and the students who are the ultimate beneficiaries of it, the Heller team believes that buildOn will make the most of these tools and recommendations to strengthen the organization’s already powerful impact on youth and their communities.
APPENDIX A: Logic Model

Assumptions

- Youth develop self-confidence through taking on and fulfilling roles of responsibility.
- Through service, youth discover personal strengths and thus, can envision expanded possibilities for their future.
- When given the opportunity, youth will take the lead as powerful agents of change in their communities.
- Through global education, youth become more interested in and act on global social issues.
- Self-confident, empowered youth are more likely to be academically engaged.
- Youth will develop compassion for others if made aware of needs in their community, and if they take on responsibility for addressing those needs.
- Through service, youth develop pride in themselves, which is reinforced by positive recognition from teachers, community members, and peers.
- By setting and meeting goals, youth develop confidence in their ability to determine the course of their own lives.
- When youth see the impact they can have on others, they are able to imagine a better future for themselves and their communities.

Inputs

- Youth

Activities

- Mentoring Relationships with PC
- Community Service
- Project Planning through Sponsorship
- Goal Setting through Sponsorship
- Global Education Activities
- Leadership Positions
- After-School Meetings
- Tink for Knowledge
- Team Building
- Recognition
- Facilitated Reflection
- Summer Program

Outcomes

- Empowerment
- Leadership & Teamwork Skills
- Empathy & Compassion
- Self Worth
- Agency
- Hope
- Personal & Social Development
- Academic Achievement/Engagement
- Civic Engagement
- Expanded Awareness of Social Issues

Impact

- Empowered, confident, and socially committed youth
- Stronger communities
APPENDIX B: buildOn After-School Program Outcomes

Empowerment
Belief in one’s ability to determine the course of one’s own life.

Agency
Belief in one’s ability to effect change in the world.

Leadership & Teamwork Skills
The skills necessary to plan projects and organize resources to implement them.

Personal & Social Development
Markers of personal growth and maturity, including appreciation of differences and development of personal responsibility.

Empathy & Compassion
Willingness and desire to understand and value others’ experiences.

Self-Worth
Belief that one is worthy of esteem or respect.

Expanded Sense of Possibility/Hope
Belief that a better world for oneself and others is possible.

Academic Engagement
Increased involvement in and enjoyment of school-related activities and relationships.

Civic Engagement
A sense of social responsibility; willingness and commitment to acting to address needs in one’s community.

Expanded Awareness of Social Issues
The ability to recognize and understand issues of social concern locally and globally.
APPENDIX C: THEORY OF CHANGE WORKSHOP: Staff & Students

Staff
Designed by Heller MBA consulting team, July 2010

Workshop Purpose: To engage staff in thinking about buildOn’s theory of change

- What does buildOn aim to accomplish through its afterschool programming (outcomes), and how (activities)?
- What assumptions underlie the connection between those activities and outcomes?

Staff will collectively compile a list of all of buildOn’s activities and outcomes. They will then refine their definition of the outcomes, and think of ways those outcomes are actually observed in students (indicators). Staff will also think about the relationship between activities and outcomes, examining the assumptions behind buildOn’s theory of change.

Activities Brainstorming (15 min)

Purpose: For staff to begin thinking about all of the activities that create the intended program outcomes

Explanation of Activity: Invite participants to create a list of all the activities that the students participate and engage in throughout their buildOn experience.

Materials: Marker(s), flipchart

Output: A compiled list of all buildOn activities. Keep this aside for participants to reference during the next two exercises.

Directions:

1. Ask the staff to list all the buildOn activities they can think of.
2. The facilitator writes each activity on the flipchart paper.

Outcome Brainstorming: (1 hour)

Purpose: For staff to think about and agree upon the major outcomes (or “results”) that youth experience as a result of participating in buildOn.

Explanation of Activity: Brainstorm the outcomes that youth experience as a result of participation in buildOn programming.
- What do youth get out of participating in buildOn and all of the activities listed in the previous activity?
- What are these outcomes, including intentional, unintentional, desired (where buildOn might be falling short of a desired outcome) and realized?

Materials: Markers, post-it notes, and a wall or blackboard

Output: The staff’s collective ideas on the top outcomes of buildOn (desired as well as realized).
Directions:

1. **Individuals:** Pass out sticky notes to all staff members. Instruct them to take 5-10 minutes to brainstorm all of their perceived current and desired outcomes for buildOn participants, in both the short term and long term.

2. **Small groups:** (To be done silently.) Divide the group into small groups (3-4 people). Give each group empty wall space in different parts of the room. Each person places all the sticky notes on the wall at random. Then, together they group the sticky notes into what they see as categories of outcomes. Redundant sticky notes can be eliminated.

3. Now talking **in the small group**, identify “names” for the categories of outcomes.

4. In each **group**, pick a reporter to share findings with the larger group.

5. The facilitator writes all of these outcomes on the flipchart.

6. Ask the group if there are any other outcomes they feel should be there that aren’t – and if so, why.
   - How comprehensive is this list?
   - Are we in consensus?
   - Do some outcomes stand out as more important than others?

**BREAK**

**Defining Outcomes: (1 hour)**

**Purpose:**

- To help staff begin to unpack some of the details and context-specific examples of each outcome. For example, if one of the outcomes is empowerment, what does that actually mean in the context of buildOn members’ lives?
- To help staff begin to see the connections between activities and outcomes, and the assumptions that underlie those causal relationships.

**Explanation of Activity:** This activity helps staff begin to see the connection between activities and outcomes, as well as more clearly define outcomes.

- What do the outcomes mean in context. E.g. what does it really mean to be empowered or have a stronger sense of civic responsibility?
- What are the underlying assumptions of the connections between the activities and outcomes? (e.g. how/why does community service make students feel they can make a difference?)
- What are some indicators that the program is achieving these outcomes?

**Materials:** Flipchart paper, markers

**Output:** For each outcome, staff have provided a cohesive definition and examples from specific students (e.g., potential indicators of students achieving those outcomes). In addition, staff have thought about how activities lead to outcomes and why.

**Preparation:** Write each outcome on the top of a piece of big flipchart paper and put each piece of paper up on the walls around the room. (The “gallery”).

1. Explain that first, staff will brainstorm individually about the definitions and indicators of the identified outcomes.
2. Give each staff member a marker and ask them to walk around the gallery of outcomes and write a word association or description of the outcome in the buildOn context.

3. When the staff is done, have them sit in a circle.

4. For each outcome, have staff discuss their definitions and explanations. Encourage staff to share anecdotes about specific examples of each outcome that they have seen in students. Potentially ask: Is there a difference in outcomes in the short-term vs. long-term?

5. Encourage staff to discuss how they think the activities lead to the outcomes (e.g. the assumptions behind buildOn’s theory of change).

Students

Designed by Heller MBA consulting team, July 2010; some activities adapted from Claudia Liebler.

Workshop Purpose:

- For students to reflect on the impact that the buildOn program has had on their attitudes, knowledge, and behavior thus far
- For students to consider some of the longer-term impacts the program may have on their lives in the future
- For students to offer feedback on what outcomes they have noticed the most among themselves and their peers
- For students to give examples of “indicators,” i.e., ways to measure the outcomes they have noticed among themselves and their peers

Students will be guided through a process of identifying short- and long-term outcomes of the program, prioritizing these outcomes according to examples from their own lives and the lives of their peers, and offering ideas for how these outcomes can be measured.

Introductions & Purpose of Workshop (10 min.)

Purpose: To introduce the facilitators to the students and to give students an overview of why their participation in the workshop is valuable.

Directions:

1. Facilitators should introduce themselves to the students, telling students their names and an interesting fact about themselves.

2. Facilitators should offer the following as an overview of the purpose of the workshop:
   - buildOn is in the process of designing an evaluation to understand the impact of its afterschool program on youth participants.
   - Today you will be asked to share ideas and examples from your experiences in the program.
   - The information that you share will be used to better understand the program’s impact and to design the evaluation.
   - None of the information that you share today will be tied to your name or other identifying factors – everything is anonymous.
   - Please share as openly as you can; however, if there are times you’d rather not speak up, you don’t have to.

3. Facilitators then should present the agenda for the workshop: Icebreaker, “5 x 5,” break, “Picture Yourself,” lunch, “Vote with Your Feet,” and “Gallery Walk.”
Icebreaker (15 min)

**Purpose:** To allow participants and facilitators to get to know each other and feel more at ease interacting with each other.

**Directions:** Facilitators lead an icebreaker of their choice.

5 x 5 Activity (30 – 40 min.)

**Purpose:** For students to brainstorm ideas about a) what draws them to the buildOn program, and b) what the short-term outcomes of the program have been for them.

**Explanation of Activity:** This activity involves generating numerous answers to insightful questions about the buildOn program. Facilitators provide students with a list of questions (written on a flipchart paper or on the blackboard), which students will then write across the top of a blank sheet of paper, drawing lines to divide the paper into columns (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Why did you come to buildOn when you first joined?</th>
<th>Q2. Why do you come to buildOn now?</th>
<th>Q3. What has been the biggest change in yourself since you joined buildOn?</th>
<th>Q4. What skills or abilities do you have now that you didn’t have before?</th>
<th>Q5. How has buildOn affected your high school experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After students write their responses to the first question, s/he passes the piece of paper to the student on his/her right. The value of this activity lies in that when filling in the boxes, participants cannot repeat an answer they have written already OR an answer that someone else has written for that question. For instance, if a participant answers Q1, “Why did you come to buildOn when you first joined?” with the response, “My friends told me it was fun,” she is not allowed to write this response for
Q1 on any of the papers that are passed to her next. The next student who receives the piece of paper from her also cannot write that response.

**Materials:** Flipchart paper with questions written out ahead of time, blank pieces of paper to hand out to students, pens

**Directions:**

3. Explain the purpose of the activity – to brainstorm ideas about what has drawn students to the program and what changes students have experienced as a result of participating in the program.
4. Pass out sheets of paper and pens to students.
5. Ask students to draw horizontal and vertical lines on their sheets of paper, so as to form a grid (shown in the diagram above)
6. Present the list of questions to students, such as on a flipchart paper or written on the blackboard, and ask students to write the questions across the top of their papers.
7. Instruct students to write one answer to the first question, then pass the paper to the person sitting to their right. Once they have received their neighbor’s paper, they must write a different answer than the one they have just written AND a different answer than the one their neighbor has written.
8. Students should continue to pass the papers around until all five rows have been filled for the first question. At this point, the process restarts with the question in the second column.
9. Continue the process until all five questions have been answered, and each sheet has a completed grid.

**BREAK** (10 min.)

- While students are taking their break, facilitators should begin reviewing some of the outcomes that students have written during the 5 x 5 activity – in particular, students’ responses to Questions 3 and 4.
- Facilitators will use these outcomes later on in the workshop for the “Vote with Your Feet” activity and the “Gallery Walk.”

**Energizer (5 min.)
Purpose:** To energize the group

**Directions:** Facilitators lead an energizer of their choice.

**Picture Yourself (45 min.)
Purpose:** For students to brainstorm ideas about the long-term impacts of participating in buildOn.

**Explanation of Activity:** This activity has two parts. During the first part, students reflect quietly about how the program will affect in their lives in the long term. During the second part, students share their ideas with one another and draw pictures of each other in five years’ time “with and without buildOn.”

**Materials:** Pieces of paper, pens, flipchart paper (at least one sheet per student), tape, markers

**Directions:**

1. Facilitators should hand out pieces of paper and pens to all students.
2. Facilitators instruct students to spend approximately 10 minutes brainstorming ideas about what their lives will be like five years from now. Brainstorm ideas in two versions of the future: 1) one version in which they have participated in buildOn, and 2) another version in which they have not
(“with buildOn” and “without buildOn). Students can think about what their interests would be, what they would be doing, what type of person they would be, etc.

3. After 10 minutes, each student should find a partner and take turns sharing what they wrote down.
4. During this time, the facilitators hand out pieces of flipchart paper and markers.
5. The students will have approximately 20 minutes to draw pictures on the flipchart paper of what their partner’s life would be like in five years, with and without buildOn.
6. After everyone has finished drawing, each pair presents their drawings to the bigger group.

**LUNCH** (30 min.)

- During lunch, facilitators should continue to draw out the short-term outcomes that students identified during the 5 x 5 activity, as well as long-term outcomes mentioned during “Picture Yourself.” Facilitators will use these outcomes for the “Vote with Your Feet” activity and the “Gallery Walk.”

**Vote with Your Feet (30 – 40 min.)**

**Purpose:**

- For students to give their feedback on the short- and long-term outcomes mentioned so far during the workshop.
- For facilitators to gain a sense of where there is agreement among students on which outcomes the students have most commonly experienced or noticed among their peers.

**Explanation of Activity:** This activity involves facilitators reading off a series of statements drawn directly from the outcomes that the students identified earlier on in the workshop. For example:

  - “Because of buildOn, I feel more confident participating in class.”
  - “Because of buildOn, in five years I’ll be working as a nurse.”
  - “Because of buildOn, I’m more tolerant of different types of people.”

Since not all students are equally eager to speak in front of a group, this activity allows students to “vote with their feet” – i.e., give their opinions based on where they are standing, instead of by speaking in a group discussion.

**Materials:** None

**Directions:**

1. Inform students that the facilitator will read off a series of statements, which they will have a chance to respond to by “voting with their feet.”
2. Designate one corner of the room as “Strongly Disagree,” while the opposite corner of the room is “Strongly Agree.” Indicate where the “middle” is, which represents neutral.
3. Facilitators then read the first statement out loud, and students place themselves along the spectrum (i.e., the location in the room) that corresponds to how they feel about the statement. Facilitators should emphasize that students may respond according to their own experiences, or what they have noticed among their friends or peers in buildOn.
4. After students have arranged themselves in response to each question, the facilitator should call on 2 - 3 students to explain why they “voted” as they did. In particular, it is helpful to hear from students who have opposing viewpoints. Any group leaders who are not facilitating this activity should make notes about which outcomes the group most agreed with.
5. Continue the process until the group has responded to all the statements on the list, or until the facilitator notices the group is ready to be finished (according to non-verbal cues).
**BREAK** (5 min.)

- While students are taking their break, facilitators should write on flipchart paper one- to two-word headers to describe the outcomes identified throughout the workshop. For example, “Tolerance,” “Academic Engagement,” “Commitment to Social Issues,” etc. These flipcharts will be used for the Gallery Walk.

**Gallery Walk: (30 min.)**

*Purpose:* The purpose of this activity is to allow students to brainstorm indicators for each of the outcomes they have identified throughout the workshop.

*Explanation of Activity:* In this activity, facilitators post flipchart paper throughout the room with one outcome written at the top of each sheet. Students, who each have a marker, are invited to walk around the room and write on the flipchart paper examples of attitudes or behaviors they would expect from someone who possesses that characteristic. For example, on the poster that says, “Commitment to Social Issues,” students might write, “Organizes community service events.”

*Materials:* Flipchart paper, tape, markers

*Directions:*

1. Post the flipchart paper (one outcome written on each sheet) throughout the room.
2. Pass out markers to students, and inform that throughout the next 10 minutes, they will have the chance to walk around the room and write down on each sheet examples of behaviors or attitudes they might expect to see from someone who has that characteristic. This is a silent activity.
3. After the 10 minutes is up, gather the group together and ask them to spend a few minutes walking around the room and reading what all of their peers have written.
4. Invite the students to respond to what they have read. Do they agree with all of the characteristics? Is there anything that has been left out?

**Closing (10 min.)**

*Purpose:* To thank students for their participation in the workshop, and to invite them to reflect on the experience.

*Explanation:* Facilitators are free to choose their own closing activity for the workshop. If they do not have a closing activity readily available, the following activity works well for this purpose.

*Materials:* None

*Directions:*

1. Students and facilitators stand together in a circle.
2. Facilitators express their appreciation to students for participating in the workshop, and reiterate how the students’ input will be useful to build on in the evaluation process.
3. Facilitators invite each person in the circle (including themselves) to go around and share 1-2 words about how they are feeling after the day’s workshop, or about something that they learned.
APPENDIX D: Staff Workshop Results

Identified Outcomes and Possible Indicators:

Leadership & Planning
- Applying to be officers
- Applying to go on Trek
- Leading meeting or reflection in front of their peers
- Initiating activities (within meeting or service context - “I want to do this next” - “Should I take this outside and put it here”)
- Setting up activities independently of the PC
- Calling other students to make sure they show up
- Recruiting for the program
- Direct involvement in planning sponsorship activities, as measured by how much they raised vs. how high their goal was

Empowerment
- Attendance
- Ability to articulate to others why they are a part of the program
- Ability to make positive choices

People/Social/Life skills
- Reports from teachers that students are happier/more involved
- Changed/improved relationships with teachers and the other adults in their lives
- Ability to work with teammates in a constructive manner
- Taking opportunities for public speaking (gala speaker, etc.)
- Ability to step up to an adult/peer and introduce themselves and connect in a way beyond just a professional relationship
- Trek presentations
- Working with others outside of their social circle, different backgrounds
- Taking the initiative to introduce themselves to others

Expanded Worldview/Cultural Understanding
- Able to define “developing country”
- Willingness to challenge themselves and try new things (specifically on trek)
- Understanding and embracing differences
- Participation in advocacy projects
- Planning advocacy projects
- Geography
- Healthy debate
- Desire to learn about new cultures and visit new places
- Ability to identify “global issues” in the world
- Ability to look at their own community with a critical eye and connect it to global activities

Sense of Responsibility/Desire to Serve
- Come up with their own service ideas
- Show up consistently (transition from dropping in once or twice to the core who come to every project)
- Ability to articulate why they serve
• Initiate and respond to communication to/from PC
• Community mapping, identifying needs in their communities, planning to address them
• Being on time/communicating when they will be late
• Doing ongoing service/service on their own
• Going back to the service site on their own
• Calling a service site to set up a project
• Convincing their parents to let them do service
• Ability to recognize issues of social injustice or inequality and suggest more sophisticated solutions to those issues

Long Term
• Ability to use the skills learned outside of the program and in the future
• Likely to participate in community service on a regular basis in the future
• Career
APPENDIX E: Student Workshop Results

Why did you come to buildOn when you first joined?

- Gave me a hands-on approach to learn about how to help global communities.
- Because it would help me get a scholarship.
- Because I thought it would open new opportunities for me.
- I wanted to build my confidence.
- Because I thought it was a better use of my free time.
- I was really interested to help out my community with this program.
- To be aware of my community and/or world.
- For getting leadership skills.
- To build leadership skills.
- Because I thought it is very important to do community service.

Additional:

- I came to know more about the program.
- Make friends and meet people.
- To build confidence and character.
- Because I heard that I need 80 hours of community service to go into away college.
- Because I got bored at home.
- Because it was my first club to join in 9th grade, first club I learned about.
- Because I read the flyer and it seemed unique.
- A friend told me to go.
- I need volunteer hours.
- Because upper classmen encouraged me to join and travel as they did.
- For college application.
- I heard about trek Mali and I was interested in joining.
- To have an afterschool activity on my resume.
I'm in the IB program and I need hours to get my IB diploma.

Because I hate to be at home.

**Why do you come to buildOn now?**

- Because I enjoy making a difference
- To learn about how I can help make the world a better place.
- Because it's still an awesome way to help both youth and abroad.
- I can gain leadership skills.
- Because the feeling you have when you help others is very good.
- Because I like to help others and it gives me satisfaction because I am making a difference.
- I come now because I now know my community needs a lot more service than I thought.
- I want to help my community with my friends through the services buildOn provides.
- Because I enjoy helping my community.
- It’s a great experience.

**Additional:**

- I am always going to different locations.
- Because help is the most beautiful thing that you can do for others.
- The feeling I have after a good day of service.
- It makes me feel like a better person.
- I am turning into a better leader.
- Because it helps so many people like I hope to do in the future.
- The services we go to are interesting.
- Because I have a lot of compassion and responsibility.
- Because I want to show I am still dedicated despite my tough schedule.
- Because it inspired me since the day of my first meeting.
- Productive on days I am free.

**What is the biggest change in yourself since you joined buildOn?**

- I am a busier, more productive person now.
• My desire to help others has been increased.
• I have become a better leader.
• I have become more active in my community.
• I have become a better friend.
• More active in the community.
• I enjoy doing more community service now and helping others.
• I have become more active in my community.
• I became inspired to volunteer on my own.
• I am making a change in the world.

Additional:

○ I don’t waste as much time as I used to.
○ I care about others now.
○ I am really engaged doing community service.
○ I am more aware of certain situations and take it upon myself to try and help to fix them.
○ I’ve become more confident in my abilities
○ I feel more empowered.
○ I definitely care about the community more and I help anybody for no profit, even complete strangers.
○ I want to student human rights, didn’t know that before.
○ I have become more mature.
○ I am better at leading events.
○ I am more aware of everyday problems.
○ I have learned about more places in the city.
○ I’ve learned how my small actions impact my community.
○ I became more compassionate.
○ I actually do activities with my family to make them happy now.
○ I have been able to do something rather than wish or hope I can help my community.
○ I am not as shy a person as before.
What skills or abilities do you have now because of buildOn that you didn’t have before?

- Communication skills.
- Taking care of babies.
- I am better at helping others.
- Now I know many ways to help others.
- Ability to really understand other people’s problems.
- Patience.
- Leadership skills.
- I have better leadership skills.
- I learned how to fundraise and help people in trouble.
- I always offer my help to others.

Additional:

  - Working with kids and making them happier.
  - I am better at understanding people.
  - I know how to behave more professionally.
  - I now know how to plant trees.
  - How to use a shovel.
  - Teamwork.
  - I have the ability to put myself in other people’s situations.
  - Making balloon animals.
  - I can now lead my peers to achieve any set goals.
  - Ability to plan events and communicate effectively.
  - I know how to communicate to the administration at school.
  - Meat delivering.
  - Better effective listening skills.
  - I now have the ability to work with other people.
  - More receptive to different personalities.
  - Fundraising.
What is different about your high school experience because of buildOn?

- I communicate with my teachers a lot more so I got higher grades.
- I helped more students get involved and have fun doing so.
- I enjoy being in high school more than before.
- I started helping other students from lower grades apply for programs.
- I became more committed.
- I was more active within my school.
- I help more people within and outside the school.
- I reached out to more students despite any differences/discrepancies I had with them.
- I am more involved at school activities.
- I now know more ideas I can bring to help my school.

Additional:

- I now know more people.
- I made friends with freshman and sophomores even though I was a junior.
- I am able to participate more in class. I learned how to look for colleges based on the interests I discovered through buildOn.
- I learned to be more patient.
- I learned more about the outside world.
- I learned how to take care of my school stuff.
- I am recognized as a leader.
- Teachers recognized other strengths I have.
- More people look up to me.
- Global education helped me boost my grades in high school.
- Other students not in club help us fundraise as well because they feel inspired by us.
- I help a lot of people with their homework instead of just my friends.
- I care about my teacher now because of buildOn.
- I joined another after school activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imagine your life in five years with buildOn and without buildOn:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>With buildOn</strong></td>
<td><strong>Without buildOn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 1</strong></td>
<td>Undergraduate at a good university. Continue to volunteer. Better opportunities. More experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In a not so good university. Do not care about the community. Little opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 2</strong></td>
<td>Traveling to a lot of countries. Volunteering three times a week. Being on the KEEN committee. Majoring in culture, childcare, or social worker. Leading a lot of projects. Being a buildOn program and trek coordinator. Making a program for undeveloped countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being in the same place without traveling. Only helping myself and others I know. Only working, dancing, and fighting. Not being as social. Not volunteering anywhere. Not reaching toward any communities. Limited on people I spend time with. Not being involved in many activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 3</strong></td>
<td>I will be committed to learning more about what is going on around the world and helping people around the world. I will be focused on my major and how I can use my major to help my family and to travel and help people around the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will be more committed to what is going on in my community and help those in my neighborhood. I will be focused on my major and focused on helping my family and traveling to Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 4</strong></td>
<td>Remaining in college with a scholarship. I would be volunteering with kids and other organizations. Would be aware and helping with social issues outside my country. Would be satisfied with my life and working to help make the world better. Would be successful in college and would probably have a car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working two jobs to pay off loans for school. Wouldn't be helping people while yearning to. Wouldn't be as satisfied with my accomplishments. Wouldn't have a car. Wouldn't have a scholarship because of lack of community service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 5</strong></td>
<td>A degree in human rights and international studies or education studies. Have studied abroad to Chile with Trinity to learn about human rights. Learning what I can do in the future with a degree. AmeriCorps member. Applying for Peace Corps. Returning to my high school to present my progress as a member of buildOn. Donating a portion of my salary to buildOn. Mentoring someone. Learning or applying to be a Fulbright Scholar. Feeling a sense of accomplishment. Helping to visit my former host village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree in English or Art History. Still looking to get involved in my community. Not have filled my dream to help others. Not as outgoing... maybe. Not as passionate about a cause. Sense of disappointment because may not have been pro-active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 6</strong></td>
<td>In a very good university. More career options. More experienced with different types of tasks that can help me in college. Better chances of getting yourself in great opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe not in a university as good if I was in buildOn. Less career options. Might be more difficult to go through college with the lack of knowledge that I should get from buildOn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 7</strong></td>
<td>My life will be nice because I will take care of the poor people. My job will be something that really helps others like doctor, donator, etc. Generous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Someone that don’t care of other. A profession that don’t donate, not even a cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 8</strong></td>
<td>I will still be doing buildOn activities. Generous. Helping in every way I can. Studying system engineering in college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who only cares about himself. Blinded by pride. Unhappy and lonely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>I will be a helpful person. I will offer my help to those people that need it. I will give things that I don't need to those who need it. Help to change the community. I will be involved in the programs that my community face.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: Annotated Bibliography of Key Sources

Youth Development Outcomes

Civic Engagement and High School Academic Progress: An Analysis Using NELS Data (Dávila & Mora, 2007)
This study uses data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 to investigate whether civic engagement (defined as student government and/or community service) is related to academic outcomes including academic progress and likelihood of acquiring higher education. The study finds that students who are civically engaged, in particular those who engage in voluntary community service, have a higher likelihood of remaining in school and acquiring a college degree.

Making Educational Progress: Links to Civic Engagement During the Transition to Adulthood, (Finlay & Flanagan, 2009)
This working paper summarizes a study of the relationship between educational progress and civic engagement for young adults with interest in community service. The study used AmeriCorps members as its subjects, with youth who had expressed interest in but not applied to the program as a comparison group. Of note is both the methodology (in particular the use of youth who had expressed interest but not applied as a comparison group) and the results, which found that respondents who made educational progress were more likely to demonstrate attitudes and behaviors of civic engagement such as voting and volunteer service.

Civic Measurement Models: Tapping Adolescents Civic Engagement: (Flanagan, Syvertsen, & Stout, 2007)
The study carried out by CIRCLE (Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement) measures young peoples’ civic behaviors with indicators such as: ability to engage in civic action, express political voice, and critically analyze political messages. CIRCLE’s research serves as reference for measuring political efficacy and its relation to civic engagement. Political efficacy as used CIRCLE’s analysis is an expansion of lead social and cognitive psychologist, Albert Bandura, PhD, and is defined as “an individual’s belief that s/he is capable of executing a course of action to accomplish a task or series of tasks within a specific domain.” The study serves as a strong example of in-depth survey tool to identify specific civic engagement skills and attitudes for youth. The approach used in this study is based in a higher level of statistical analysis and would require a trained analyst in order to replicate.

The Positive Development of Youth (Lerner, Lerner, & Phelps, 2008)
Looking at youth development as tied to and influenced by the environment in which the youth live and their interaction and relationship with it. The authors identify the “Five C’s” of positive youth development, which include: Competence, Confidence, Connection, Character and Caring. By embodying these Five C’s, youth are more likely to lead lives of contribution to themselves, their families and to their communities. In order to measure positive youth development though out of school related activities, researchers in this study carried out a longitudinal study over several years, enabling them to draw conclusions that connected the Five C’s and youth’s contribution to family and community.
Evaluation Guides for Youth Development

Reflect and Improve: A Toolkit for Engaging Youth and Adults as Partners in Program Evaluation (Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development, 2005)
A comprehensive toolkit developed to help youth development agencies strengthen their program planning and evaluation. Chapter 5: Developing and Implementing an Evaluation Plan, is particularly useful, and includes information on and activities for taking stock of resources, identifying stakeholders, and establishing goals, indicators, and questions.

Educators Guide to Service Learning Program Evaluation, (National Service Learning Clearinghouse, 2001)
The National Service Learning Clearinghouse stresses the importance of evaluation to measure effectiveness in desired program outcomes for service learning organizations. This resource serves as an excellent guide for planning and implementing with 6 primary steps for effective program evaluation. These steps include assessing program outcomes, deciding the depth of analysis, measuring change with before and after or comparative study groups, selecting information resources, deciding measurement methods, and conducting evaluation research. The toolkit provides worksheets as guides through each step.

Documenting Progress and Demonstrating Results: Evaluating Local Out-Of-School Time Programs (Little, DuPree, & Deich, 2002)
This guide, from researchers at the Harvard Family Research Project and The Finance Project, gives general background on evaluating programs, developing logic models, and offers a five-tiered approach to choosing an evaluation strategy. In addition, the guide covers how to communicate evaluation data and results to stakeholders. Two appendices provide a primer on evaluation terminology and a review of data-collection methods.

Monitoring & Evaluation Guides

Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods and Approaches (The World Bank, 2004)
Noting the importance of monitoring and evaluation of development programs as a means to present results, this article compiles a list of monitoring and evaluation methods and relative cost implications. Each method is outlined with its effective advantages and disadvantages as a means of measuring program outcomes and results.

Measuring Empowerment in Practice: Structuring Analysis and Framing Indicators (Alsop & Heinsohn, 2005)
This article addresses the complexity of measuring empowerment, focusing primarily on international development projects. However, the basic definition of empowerment, as a person’s ability to make effective choices, as well as the evaluation structure of how to measure empowerment, serve as an informative framework of measuring empowerment beyond an international development context.

Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System (Kusek & Rist, 2004)
There exists a growing trend in development programs not only measuring implementation as a mark of success, but results that implementation generated. This is an extensive handbook for leaders who are charged with managing program implementations and measuring results and impact. The results based monitoring and evaluations frameworks presented in this article focus on international development programs, but are transferable to other development contexts.

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation, which supports many youth service initiatives, published this guide as a resource for its grantees in developing and using a logic model and theory of change. It provides several useful exercises for developing models, and several templates for models based on their intended use. This guide would be helpful to buildOn as it considers future revisions of its logic model and theory of change.

**Summer Of Service Evaluation Toolkit PILOT** (Melchior, 2010)
This pilot evaluation toolkit was provided to the Heller team by author Alan Melchior of Brandeis University’s Center for Youth and Communities. It gives a thorough overview of how to conduct an evaluation of a youth service program, including: a basic primer on program evaluation; a guide to preparing for evaluation including the logic model development process; guidance on evaluation implementation; and advice on data analysis and use. The SOS Toolkit informed many of the Heller Team’s recommendations on the use of pre- and post-surveys and comparison groups.

**Evaluations by Comparable Organizations**

**The City Year Experience: Putting Alumni on the Path to Lifelong Civic Engagement** (Anderson & Fabiano, 2007)
In efforts to measure the long-term impact of City Year's program, the organization administered a longitudinal study with City Year alumni and their continued civic engagement. Impact indicators for the City Year study include, civic skills and participation, educational attainment, and career attainment. The study serves as a model of a long-term impact measurement process, which includes an in-depth analysis with an identified control group for comparison.

An online database and bibliography containing citations for out-of-school time (OST) program evaluations and research studies currently being tracked by the Harvard Family Research Project. The studies can be sorted by categories including Service-Learning/Civic Engagement, Positive Youth Development, Mentoring, and Youth Leadership. A useful resource for seeing what similar organizations are doing in terms of evaluation.
## APPENDIX G: Analysis of buildOn 2010 Survey

(Key findings are highlighted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Key Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Where do you live?</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Name and name of HS</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What is your current grade level?</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What are you planning to do after high school?</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>If you are attending college in the fall, did you include buildOn in your personal statements or college essays?</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Program Performance</td>
<td>67.3% of those who responded said yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Do you believe your participation in buildOn made you a stronger college applicant?</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>93.5% of those who responded said yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How has buildOn been influential in your life?</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>What is your sex/gender?</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>How long have you been a member of buildOn?</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>In a typical week, how many hours are you involved in buildOn activities (meetings, service, sponsorship, workshops)?</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Why did you join the buildOn program (what initially appealed to you)? You can select more than one answer.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>Program Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>How has your overall buildOn experience been?</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>Program Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Which buildOn Core Activity is most important to you?</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Program Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Please rate the QUALITY of each Core Activity in your program.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Program Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>When is the best time for you to participate in community service?</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Program Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you volunteer regularly with 1 service provider?</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: I tutor elementary children every Tuesday or I serve food at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a shelter on the same Saturday each month.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with what your program has been able to accomplish</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a buildOn passport?</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please select the answer below which best describes your feelings</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the buildOn Passport?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have you gained from the buildOn program? Please ALL answers that</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apply to you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a scale from 10 to 0, please select the impact buildOn has had in</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your life (10 = the greatest impact and 0 = no impact).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel like you can make a difference?</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has buildOn contributed to the feeling of being able to make a</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate the buildOn staff member who works with your school in each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>category. My Program Coordinator is...</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here's your chance to recognize the AMAZING buildOn STAFF for all their</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard work. How about a Shoutout to your Program Coordinator or Trek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader. What do you like about him or her? How has he or she helped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you or your program this year? Please include the staff member's name.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many programs or extracurricular activities are you involved in</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside of buildOn?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How old are you?</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is English the language most often used in your home?</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your overall grade point average?</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Please select a category that best reflects the family you live with. (You may select more than one).</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Select one or more of the following racial/ethnic categories to describe you.</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Are you eligible for free or reduced lunch?</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>What is your annual family income level?</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>60% said they didn't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>How many people live in your home?</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Types of Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Performance</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Details</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX H: Comparable Organizations Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Target Client</th>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Program Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Year</td>
<td>City Year’s mission is to “build democracy through citizen service, civic leadership, and social entrepreneurship” by breaking down social barriers, inspiring citizens to civic action, developing new leaders for the common good, and promoting and improving the concept of voluntary national service.</td>
<td>Young people between the ages of 17 and 24 (must be a U.S. citizen or permanent resident; must have a high school diploma or be willing to work towards a GED while in the City Year Corps</td>
<td>Boston, MA; Chicago, IL; Cleveland, OH; Columbia, SC; Columbus, OH; Detroit, MI; Little Rock, AR; Los Angeles, CA; Louisiana; Miami, FL; Milwaukee, WI; New Hampshire; New York, NY; Philadelphia, PA; Rhode Island; San Antonio, TX; San Jose, CA; Seattle, WA; Washington, D.C.; Johannesburg, South Africa; London, England</td>
<td>As tutors, mentors and role models, corps members help children stay in school and on track, and transform schools and communities across the United States. Just as important, during their year of service corps members develop civic leadership skills they can use throughout a lifetime of community service. Major corporations and businesses participate in our mission by serving as strategic partners, team sponsors, and national leadership sponsors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Force</td>
<td>Earth Force is a national organization that helps young people develop the civic skills and knowledge they need to create lasting solutions to environmental problems in their communities. Earth Force’s mission is to foster a scientifically capable and civically engaged populace.</td>
<td>Earth Force engages approximately 17,000 elementary, middle &amp; high school youth each year through two major programs: CAPS (Community Action and Problem Solving), in which participants identify and address a wide variety of local environmental issues, and GREEN, which focuses on watershed-related issues.</td>
<td>Capital region, Denver, Erie, Charleston, West Palm Beach, St. Petersburg, Pittsburgh, Chicago</td>
<td>Six-step model: 1) Identify local, community environmental problems; 2) Select issue for further study, research and narrow definition, 3) Identify and analyze relevant public and private policies, 4) Identify possible project options for affecting change in policy or practice and select one, 5) Develop and implement plan of action 6) Assess the project and process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Children NY</td>
<td>Friends of the Children NY is an early intervention program dedicated to helping New York City’s most at-risk children become productive, contributing members of</td>
<td>Low-income, high-risk students.</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>Full time, paid Friends work one on one with students, beginning in kindergarten or first grade and maintaining that relationship through high school graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innovations in Civic Participation’ s Summer of Service (SOS)

The goals of the SOS program are to engage young people in helping to solve critical community problems and, through this experience, build their civic, leadership and academic skills and promote higher education aspirations. The first programs funded under the SOS legislation are being implemented in the summer of 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room to Read</th>
<th>Room to Read seeks to transform the lives of millions of children in developing countries by focusing on literacy and gender equality in education. Working in collaboration with local communities, partner organizations and governments, we develop literacy skills and a habit of reading among primary school children, and support girls to complete secondary school with the relevant life skills to succeed in school and beyond.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school students in developing countries; in particular, girls.</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Laos, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, South Africa, Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income high school students (9th through 12th grade)</td>
<td>Boston, New York City, San Francisco, Philadelphia,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Upward Bound** | The goal of Upward Bound is to increase the rate at which participants complete secondary education, and enroll in and graduate from institutions of postsecondary education.  
Upward Bound serves high school students from low-income families and families in which neither parent holds a bachelor’s degree. It also offers programs specially designed for students with limited English proficiency, students from groups that are traditionally underrepresented in postsecondary education, students with disabilities, students who are homeless, students who are in foster care or are aging out of the foster care system, and other disconnected students. | Universities across the U.S. start their own programs. |  
Upward Bound projects offer extensive academic instruction as well as counseling, mentoring, and other support services. Students meet throughout the school year and generally participate in an intensive residential summer program that lasts from five to eight weeks. Most students—about 90 percent—enter Upward Bound while in the 9th or 10th grade, and about 35 percent remain with the program through high school graduation. Upward Bound projects are generally operated by two- or four-year colleges. The annual average cost per participant is about $4,200. (Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary). Upward Bound projects also provide information on the full range of Federal Student Financial Aid programs and benefits; and guidance and assistance on secondary school re-entry, alternative education programs, or entry into general educational development programs or postsecondary education. |

| **YouthBuild** | The mission of YouthBuild USA is to unleash the intelligence and positive energy of low-income youth to rebuild their communities and their lives. YouthBuild USA seeks to join with others to help build a movement toward a  
Extremely disadvantaged, unemployed, and undereducated young people ages 16-24 who usually have been a part of foster care, the juvenile justice system, welfare, or homelessness | Headquarters in Somerville, MA and programs across the country | The YouthBuild program includes the following components: 1. Alternative School: helps youth participants obtain their GED 2. Community Service: youth build houses in low-income communities. 3. Pre-apprenticeship: job training for construction skills. 4. Leadership development and civic engagement: youth help shape program policies. 5. Youth Development: peer counseling, goal setting and life planning. 6. Long-term mini-community: building relationships with alumni. 7. |
A more just society in which respect, love, responsibility, and cooperation are the dominant unifying values, and sufficient opportunities are available for all people in all communities to fulfill their own potential and contribute to the well-being of others.

| Community development: service to community organizations |
## APPENDIX I: Comparable Organizations’ Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Evaluation Techniques</th>
<th>Interesting to note</th>
<th>Evaluation team or external evaluators</th>
<th>Public presentation of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Year</td>
<td>City Year conducts evaluation for the purposes of internal learning, program design, and refinement, as well as to meet external funding needs. City Year surveys teachers, principals/school liaisons, and students at multiple times of year. Also utilizes student school data, observations, and focus groups. Some of the work is conducted by an internal team and some by third party evaluators. In 2002, Policy Studies Associates (PSA) initiated the &quot;City Year Alumni Studies,&quot; a set of three, interlocking studies designed to assess City Year’s impact on civic engagement and social capital among alumni at various intervals of time after City Year. The study’s three components include: (1) the Alumni Cohort Study, a mail survey of 2,189 City Year alumni; (2) the Study of City Year Parents, a telephone survey designed to gain additional insight into the effects of City Year on younger alumni and their families; and (3) the Longitudinal Study of Alumni, which involves longer, open-ended telephone interviews with a sample of recent alumni and a matched sample of non-participants. For the Longitudinal Study of Alumni, PSA conducted interviews twice over the course of the four-year study: once in spring 2004, nearly a year after corps members had completed their year of service, and again in spring 2006, nearly three years after corps members completed their year of service.</td>
<td>In City Year’s Alumni Cohort Study, PSA did not establish its own &quot;control group,&quot; but rather used secondary analyses of publicly available datasets, including the National Election Study of 2000 and 2002, and the National Civic Engagement Study of the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE). The Alumni Cohort Study measured educational attainment in terms of &quot;additional years of education completed.&quot; The evaluation also measured career attainment, and found that 60 percent of corps members felt that City Year had influenced their career choice. (Source: PSA report, &quot;The City Year Experience&quot;). In the Longitudinal Study of Alumni, PSA used a random sample of 107 corps members who participated in the 2002-03 program year, compared with a group of 85 similarly situated young adults. Comparison group members were drawn from the pool of young people who applied to City Year for the 2002-03 program year, were accepted into the program, but ultimately decided not to serve (or chose to serve with another.</td>
<td>City Year has an evaluation team of four full-time staff members led by Dr. Gretchen Biesecker, a developmental psychologist with special expertise in longitudinal research, social-emotional development, and risk and resilience from childhood through young adulthood. The headquarters-based team: • Designs evaluation tools, trackers, instructions and coaching for data collection; analyzes and disseminates results through reports and other formats • Provides evaluation consultation to sites and City Year headquarters • Serves as a liaison to external evaluators and project funders • Coordinates and integrates evaluation efforts. In addition, City Year has a &quot;research page&quot; on its website where it showcases the results of two recent evaluations 1) the three-party study commenced by Policy Studies Associates (PSA) in 2002 and published in 2007, and 2) an evaluation of City Year’s &quot;Young Heroes&quot; program, a middle school service initiative led by City Year corps members. Links are provided for web visitors to download the evaluation reports. For the PSA evaluation, the webpage highlights City Year’s long-term impact on the following indicators: voting, volunteering, leadership, diversity, civic involvement, membership in community organizations, and education achievement. The Young Heroes program positively impacted participants in the following indicators: inclusivity, sense of efficacy, learning, and commitment. Young Heroes participants also gave a positive assessment to the program (Source: &quot;City Year Research Studies&quot; website).</td>
<td>City Year has a &quot;research page&quot; on its website where it showcases the results of two recent evaluations 1) the three-party study commenced by Policy Studies Associates (PSA) in 2002 and published in 2007, and 2) an evaluation of City Year’s &quot;Young Heroes&quot; program, a middle school service initiative led by City Year corps members. Links are provided for web visitors to download the evaluation reports. For the PSA evaluation, the webpage highlights City Year’s long-term impact on the following indicators: voting, volunteering, leadership, diversity, civic involvement, membership in community organizations, and education achievement. The Young Heroes program positively impacted participants in the following indicators: inclusivity, sense of efficacy, learning, and commitment. Young Heroes participants also gave a positive assessment to the program (Source: &quot;City Year Research Studies&quot; website).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Alumni Cohort Study and the Longitudinal Study of Alumni are available for download on City Year’s website (http://www.cityyear.org/researchstudies.aspx). Two current evaluations, focusing on City Year’s “Whole Child Model” (with students in grades 3 - 9) and “Diplomas Now” (City Year’s collaborative “school turnaround” model), aim to demonstrate the power of voluntary, national service to address pressing social problems, such as the high school dropout crisis in the U.S. (Source: Gretchen Biesecker).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Force</td>
<td>Earth Force works with the Center for Youth and Communities at Brandeis University to assess the impact of its programs on youth participants and educators (advisors) in order to better understand the experience of youth participants and educators, and to identify best practices to incorporate back into its programs. The annual evaluation uses a number of instruments: Students complete a survey before and after taking part in the program. Items on the baseline survey deal mostly with attitudes and knowledge. While the post-program survey includes the same items, it also adds a section on civic action skills. Earth Force asks educators in both the CAPS and GREEN programs to complete post-program surveys to examine how the program affects them, how satisfied they are with the program, and how they think the program affects their students (Source: Earth Force 2008-09 Program Evaluation). A data on participant outcomes for 2008-09 are based on a set of approximately 600 matched pre- and post-program participant surveys from Earth Force’s CAPS program and 130 participant surveys from its GREEN program sites. The evaluation also surveys educators (i.e., the program advisors). Earth Force presents its results in terms of percentage of students reporting improvement, as opposed to the indicators’ percentage point change (Source: Earth Force 2008-09 Program Evaluation). The Center for Youth and Communities at Brandeis University has conducted the Earth Force evaluation since 1997 (Source: Earth Force 2008-09 Program Evaluation). Earth Force publicizes its evaluations on its website. The 2008-09 Program Evaluation Report was advertised on its website as &quot;featured news.&quot; Clicking on the news link (<a href="http://www.earthforce.org/content/article/detail/2447">http://www.earthforce.org/content/article/detail/2447</a>) leads to a page where the evaluation &quot;headlines&quot; are summarized and there is the option to download the evaluation report. For example, Earth Force highlights the program's civic and environmental outcomes, as well as its participants' positive experience in the program. Earth Force also emphasizes that program participants who reported higher-quality program sites also reported a greater impact from the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2008-09 evaluation, published in 2010, found that Earth Force youth participants continue to rate their experience positively (83% “good” or “excellent”) and half want to be in Earth Force again (63% of those with “high quality” experiences). In addition to measuring participant satisfaction, the evaluation measured environmental responsibility and civic efficacy (Source: "Earth Force Evaluation Results 2008-2009"). Examples of indicators include: awareness of environmental issues, responsibility to help solve environmental problems, knowing how to work with others to solve issues, knowing how to contact adults to get information on issues, know how to work to change policies, and life-long commitment to community work. Within the survey, participants rate these indicators on a four-point scale. Brandeis University then analyzes the data using statistical significance (Source: Earth Force 2008-09 Program Evaluation).

| Friends of the Children NY | Friends tracks three outcomes: 1) graduation from high school with a plan for the future; 2) avoidance of the juvenile justice system and 3) avoidance of teen parenting. Friends collects academic transcripts, first getting permission from parents and individual schools. Friends also administers an annual achievement test using nationally normed achievement tests for k-12. Friends uses Efforts to Outcomes software to track results. | Friends is an interesting and relevant comparable organization for buildOn because they are a Robin Hood grantee with a strong focus on collecting academic metrics on its students. In 2010-2011, Friends plans to take advantage of NYC Department of Education plans to make student transcript available online to parents. They plan to ask parents to sign over permission to them to go online and retrieve participants’ transcript results. | Friends does a biannual third party review, hiring outside researchers to assess DOE transcript data. This data must be presented as group data. | On its website and in its 2006 annual report, Friends provides specific data about improvements in academic metrics such as student test scores and attendance, as well as progress in social and emotional development and making good choices. |
| Innovations in Civic Participation 's Summer of | Brandeis University’s Center for Youth and Communities developed a comprehensive, survey-based evaluation tool for SOS in 2009. The evaluation measures the following academic outcomes: • Increased academic motivation • Greater school attendance, | The survey measures the following academic outcomes: An SOS Evaluation Toolkit, currently in draft form, was designed for Innovations in Civic | As of August 2010, the SOS website (http://www.icicp.org/ht/d/sp/i/1254/pid/1254) was still somewhat basic, most likely since |
**Service (SOS)**

domains/indicators: understanding context, civic agency, initiative and student action (civic skills), communication skills, efficacy and connection (including civic efficacy and political efficacy), community connection, classroom connection, future civic roles, political engagement, and academic outcomes. The survey is in its pilot phase and is available only through the Center for Youth and Communities.

**Room to Read**

Room to Read monitors and evaluates its programs on an ongoing basis to: a) track project information to ensure that the organization is working effectively toward goals and objectives; b) identify strengths and weaknesses to inform program decisions and make timely improvements, and c) provide accurate and timely information about progress toward objectives to stakeholders (Source: "Tracking Results"). Evaluations focus on the effects of their programs on the students in developing countries; U.S. partner schools are a very small part of the model, and are not measured. In-country staff and partners monitor programs regularly. A variety of monitoring methods are utilized, such as interviews and surveys with key stakeholders (e.g., students and teachers), in order to collect data on program accomplishments and performance measures, and to assess progress towards program objectives. Room to Read analyzes this data using its project database. At the end of each year, Room to Read had its first external evaluation of five programs (School Room, Reading Room, Girls’ Education, Computer Room and Language Room) in four countries (Cambodia, India, Nepal and Vietnam) to assess program effectiveness and identify areas for improvement. The evaluation used a survey consisting of 66 questions that focused on teachers’ and students’ perceptions, attitudes, and self-reported behavior with regard to each Room to Read program in all of the countries. Most of the survey items were based on responses to a Likert scale of four options (where 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, and 4= Strongly Agree) about statements regarding specific characteristics of the programs. To ensure that all questions would be understood and answered in the same way, Room to Read has an entire page on its website dedicated to explaining how they track results (http://www.roomtoread.org/Page.aspx?pid=286), including monitoring and evaluation reports available for download. In addition, the website has a "Frequently Asked Questions" page dedicated to monitoring and evaluation issues. Examples of questions include, "How have you used M&E to improve your programs?" and, "Do you measure how students in Room to Read schools/programs do compared to other students? Do you conduct pre- and post-tests to measure program impact?"

**Service (SOS) continuation**

Participation by Alan Melchior at Brandeis University’s Center for Youth and Communities. This toolkit provides information on how to evaluate SOS and other, similar programs. However, at present it is not clear who the evaluation team will be for the SOS program.

**Room to Read continuation**

At present, there are nine full-time monitoring and evaluation staff: two at the Global Office, one at the Asia Regional Office, and one in each of the six Asian countries. Room to Read also plans to hire Monitoring and Evaluation Officers in Africa. Susan J. Paik (Claremont Graduate University) and Herbert J. Walberg (Stanford University) were the external evaluators for the Room to Read Evaluation 2005. This is the first summer the program will be run.
year, Room to Read collects information on program performance measures for all programs. The results of this data collection and analysis are combined with the insights and experiences of Country Offices to inform the planning and implementation process. Sri Lanka provides a good example of using evaluation results to improve programs. As a result of the recommendation that library training should be more practical, the Sri Lanka team revised their teacher librarian training curriculum. As a result of the recommendation that more training follow-up visits are needed, our partner organizations have appointed mobilizers to collaborate with our libraries, and orientation programs will make sure the mobilizers follow up as planned (Source: "Monitoring and Evaluation"). At present, Room to Read does not conduct impact evaluations using a control group. The website states: "We acknowledge the need for conducting such a treatment-control study, and are working to incorporate this into our upcoming cross-national evaluation of the Reading Room program. This evaluation is planned as a longitudinal study, allowing us to measure the impact of our efforts over time as well as compare treatment and control groups" (Source: "Monitoring and Evaluation").

various languages and cultural contexts, survey questions were asked in an interview format. Independent, professional interviewers were trained and employed in each of their own countries to administer the instrument. Random sampling was employed to represent programs, countries, respondent types (that is, primary and secondary students and teachers, and males and females), and site locations (that is, urban and rural). A total of 880 respondents answered the survey (608 students and 272 teachers). The report is available for download on the Room to Read website. In 2007, each Room to Read country in Asia conducted evaluations of the Reading Room and Local Language Publishing programs, designed by in-country M&E Program Officers in collaboration with in-country program teams. This report is also available for download online. In 2009, Room to Read began a cross-national evaluation of its Reading Room program to assess the impact of current program activities on student habits and attitudes toward reading. This evaluation started in Laos, Nepal, and Zambia, and is expanding to India, Sri Lanka, and South Africa in 2010. The organization is also conducting a process evaluation of the School Room program to measure the effectiveness of internal program
| **Summer Search** | In 2005, Summer Search launched a five-year, quasi-experimental evaluation of its program funded by the Koret Foundation, Blue Ridge Foundation New York, and the Orfalea Family Foundation (Source: Summer Search Annual Report, 2006). The five-year study, directed by Dr. Melanie Moore Kubo at See Change Evaluation, measured the impact of Summer Search on participants' educational attainment, economic self-sufficiency, and community engagement using pre and post surveys and randomized student focus groups. In 2006, Boston Consulting Group (BCG) conducted a pro-bono evaluation of Summer Search that measured outcomes such as college attendance and future earnings potential. While the BCG evaluation is not available on Summer Search's website, Summer Search did publish some of the evaluation findings in its 2006 annual report. For instance, BCG found that 97% of Summer Search seniors went to college, vs. 33% of all low-income students. This statistic demonstrates that BCG used national student data as a comparison group. Summer Search uses a RAP (reflection, altruism and performance) model of outcomes to evaluate student performance on a 1-4 scale. Students accepted into the program are expected to be a 2 in each outcome, and progress in each outcome category is assessed and tracked as students move through the program. Summer Search frequently features statistics and graphs about its evaluation outcomes in annual reports. In its 2006 annual report, Summer Search cited several of the BCG evaluation findings: "Children of Summer Search college graduates will be 90% more likely to attend college," and "Summer Search college graduates will earn close to $1 million and pay $220,000 in additional taxes over their lifetimes" (Summer Search, 2006). On its website, Summer Search also showcases results from the BCG evaluation, including the previously-mentioned information on academic outcomes, as well as qualitative outcomes such as, "72% of [participants] are involved in service to the community" and "56% of [alumni] aspire to careers in public service" (Source: Summer Search, "About Us," 2010). Summer Search's 2009 report featured a pie chart demonstrating that 99.6% of participants graduated high school in 2009, juxtaposed with a pie chart showing that 84% of Summer Search participants qualified for free or reduced lunch in 2009. | In several of its annual reports (2006, 2009), Summer Search lists academic achievement outcomes such as high school graduation rates and college attendance rates. For example, in 2009 Summer Search reported that 99.6% of its participants graduated high school (Source: Summer Search, 2009). | Boston Consulting Group conducted a pro-bono evaluation for Summer Search in 2006. Summer Search is using an external evaluator, See Change Evaluation, for its five-year longitudinal study (2005 - 2010). Summer Search has a full-time Program Quality Officer who is dedicated to supporting a consistent quality of mentoring and ensuring consistent data-entry and analysis of student and mentor performance. |
Search uses Efforts to Outcomes software to track student progress.

Additionally, the 2009 report had a page with three pie charts side-by-side, demonstrating 1) 96% of participants matriculated to a 4-year college, 2) 93% of which are first-generation college students, and 3) 89% are on track to graduate from college. It isn't clear whether Summer Search regularly collects this data on academic achievement or the data comes from the longitudinal study by See Change Evaluation.

Upward Bound

Researchers at Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. conducted evaluations of Upward Bound in 1999 and 2004. The first evaluation used a nationally representative sample of 67 Upward Bound project sites (out of 395 qualifying projects). Students were assessed at a pre-test baseline (~100% response rate), post-test (97% response rate), and 2-year follow-up (85% response rate). Surveys assessed students’ backgrounds, experiences related to school, supplemental services received, employment, and their plans for the future. Official school transcripts were also obtained for the two post-test data collection points. The evaluation demonstrated an inconclusive overall impact on four-year secondary school enrollment, but a revealed a positive impact on enrollment among students with lower educational expectations. Additionally, longer Upward Bound participation was associated with college attendance and earning of credits (Source: ChildTrend.org). The 2004 evaluation included a 3-year follow-up (81% response rate) and found varying results: the follow-up

In 2006, Berkeley Policy Associates, Abt Associates, and the Urban Institute launched a five-year, random assignment evaluation of Upward Bound’s increased focus on higher-risk students. This evaluation seeks to investigate the impacts of Upward Bound on student outcomes—including course taking, grades received, test scores, retention in high school, college preparation services received, and college and career expectations—both overall and for higher-risk students (Source: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance). Evaluation results will be available in 2011.

A study found that participation in Upward Bound does not influence enrollment or number of credits earned in post-secondary education. However, low-expectation students in Upward Bound were more likely to attend a four-year college (38%) compared with those in the control group (18% rate of attendance). The three groups of youth who benefited the most were: students entering Upward Bound with lower educational expectations, academically high-risk students, and boys. Other groups who also benefited from Upward Bound are students who are Hispanic or white, and those eligible for the program because they are either low-income, or both low-income and first-generation (Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary). Upward Bound was also found to impact student engagement in postsecondary school, increasing the likelihood of student employment in college, the number of hours per week worked during college, receipt of personal counseling, attendance at learning skills centers, and use of tutoring services.

| YouthBuild | In June 2004, Brandeis University and Temple University published, "Life After YouthBuild," a report outlining the results of a comprehensive evaluation of the program's long-term impacts for 900 participants. The evaluation was launched in 2002 and funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and by another anonymous foundation. The two themes that the evaluation examined were "success" and "self-perception." Indicators of success included: voter registration, enrollment in post-secondary education, holding a job that pays more than $10/hour, and other types of community participation. | The 11 program sites that participated in the surveys were selected based on the following factors: their expressed interest at a summer 2001 conference; the availability of the local program staff to commit to a year-long research project; and demographics mirroring the national picture, including gender, race/ethnicity, and location. The programs also had to have been in operation for at least three years. YouthBuild participants who did not complete | Brandeis University and Temple University evaluated the YouthBuild program in 2004. |
| Website has a page listing "YouthBuild Demographics and Outcomes," which gives percentages on their number of participants in various ethnic/racial groups and other social categories (whether they are on public assistance, etc.) and lists the percentages of a) attendance, b) participants who complete the program, c) placement in jobs or further education of those who complete the program, d) average wage after the program, and e) |
Indicators of “self-perception” included feelings of positive emotion and optimism about the future (Source: "Life After YouthBuild"). The evaluation used surveys and in-depth interviews as its methodology. In all, YouthBuild received 882 completed responses from the 15-page mailed survey. Interviews were conducted with 57 YouthBuild graduates as part of two-day site visits at eight sites across the country (in Bloomington, IL; Boston, MA; Brownsville, TX; Gardena (Los Angeles), CA; Madison, WI; Philadelphia, PA; St Louis, MO; and York, PA). Approximately seven interviews were conducted at each site. The interviews lasted approximately one to two hours and were audiotaped. The researchers carefully selected individuals who would represent the demographics of the sites they attended, including at least two graduates per site who had been relatively unsuccessful after leaving YouthBuild in that they were neither employed nor in school. A group of six graduates were invited to comment on the interview protocol prior to its roll-out. They were selected from two YouthBuild programs who were not part of the network of participating sites. The youth had a chance to review the interview protocol first and then there was a discussion led by Temple University. Researchers used the interview protocol from the Temple project to make sure that survey questions covered the same areas as covered in the interviews. The aim was to see if interview responses were validated by responses from the much larger survey population.

The program were not included in the surveys. As the evaluation report states, "while such a study could provide valuable information, it was outside the scope of the project."

The page does not include the percentage of participants who entered without a high school diploma and now have a GED or diploma. The page does not provide any additional information on evaluation or any links to download evaluations (Source: "YouthBuild Demographics and Outcomes").
## APPENDIX J: Comparison of Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Questionnaires/Surveys</th>
<th>Focus Group Discussion</th>
<th>Key Informant Interviews</th>
<th>Comparison Group (Quasi-experimental)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants Needed</strong></td>
<td>All participants, or a sample group representing all participants</td>
<td>Select group of stakeholders</td>
<td>Select group of students</td>
<td>Select group of buildOn students and select group of comparison students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low to Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time required</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills required</strong></td>
<td>Basic data processing and analysis skills. Basic statistical skills if survey results are analyzed using statistical significance.</td>
<td>Non-directive group facilitation, interviewing, observation, and note-taking skills; qualitative data analysis skills (sorting data by theme and interpreting its implications).</td>
<td>Same skills required as for focus group interviews.</td>
<td>A control group is selected which matches the characteristics of the program group as closely as possible. This evaluation technique may take the form of questionnaires, focus groups, interviews, or observations -- or can be conducting using pre-existing data on the comparison group (i.e., previous surveys or government information).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of training required for data collectors</td>
<td>None to some</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings from sample group can be applied to the wider group.</td>
<td>Provides flexibility to explore new ideas; context and interpretation for quantitative data collected by more formal methods; and qualitative understanding of complex outcomes, highly interactive social situations, or people's values, motivations and reactions.</td>
<td>Similar to the pros of focus group discussion.</td>
<td>The most scientifically rigorous method to track program outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many kind of information are difficult to obtain without a formal interview. Processing and data analysis can be time-consuming, particularly when comparing pre- and post-surveys. Users of this methodology need to consider whether they will be measuring changes using statistical significance, which may require a program like Stata or SPSS.</td>
<td>Unless focus groups are repeated on a widespread basis, it is difficult to generalize from the findings. Results are also less valid, reliable, and credible than formal surveys -- although this technique may be combined with formal surveys.</td>
<td>Findings usually relate to specific program sites, and thus it is difficult to generalize from findings. Less valid, reliable, and credible than formal surveys.</td>
<td>Can be costly and time-consuming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
"Reflect and Improve: A Tool Kit for Engaging Youth and Adults as Partners in Program Evaluation" (Innovation Center for Community & Youth Development, 2005)
## APPENDIX K: Additional Indicators of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Outcome</th>
<th>Survey Question/Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empowerment</strong></td>
<td>I can determine the course of my own life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m not discouraged when I’m confronted with a problem because I can usually think of several solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can usually handle whatever comes my way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to do well (succeed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t care what happens to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
<td>Has buildOn contributed to the feeling of being able to make a difference in my school, my community, and the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I know how to design and implement a community service project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I know what resources are available to help me with a project in my school or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can develop ideas about how to take action on a problem in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe I have enough influence to impact community decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy &amp; Compassion</strong></td>
<td>It is important to help other people in my community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to understand the experiences of other people in my community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to understand the experiences of other people around the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to understand other people's points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am able to understand other people's feelings and put myself in their shoes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Worth</strong></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I have a more positive attitude about myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I feel confident sharing my opinions in a group setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, my classmates respect me more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I can stand up for my opinion, even if my friends disagree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership &amp; Teamwork</strong></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I am more comfortable speaking or presenting in front of a group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can organize other students to take action on a social problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can persuade other students that a problem in my community needs to be solved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I had to describe buildOn to people who weren't familiar with me or the program in 1-2 minutes, I would be comfortable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I first try to understand what the other person is saying before I decide how I will respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I work well with teammates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Sense of Possibility</td>
<td>I know how to disagree without starting a fight or argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I have hope that a better world is possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The problems in my community are too big and/or too deep-rooted to ever be solved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The world will be a better place for the next generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I know other people who care about the same social issues that I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal &amp; Social Development</td>
<td>I enjoy and am able to work well with people from different backgrounds/walks of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think it’s important to hear others’ ideas even if I find their ideas very different from mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I look forward to trying new things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think it’s important to hear others’ ideas even if I find their ideas very different from mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to set and achieve goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manage your time so you can get all of the steps in a project done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Engagement</td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I feel like I have a wider range of options for after high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is very important for me to do the best I can in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I feel I have more to contribute in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, school has become a more positive experience for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Doing things that help improve the community is an important job for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It's okay if I don't respond to issues in my school or community, because it's not my responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel like I am an important part of my community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that it is my responsibility to be actively involved in community issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Awareness of Social Issues</td>
<td>Learning about other countries through buildOn has given me a new perspective on community issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I am able to recognize issues of inequality, locally and globally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want to learn more about other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy reading or watching the news to understand what is happening in my community and the world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L: Pilot Survey with Annotated Student Comments
APPENDIX M: Pre-Survey
APPENDIX N: Post-Survey
### APPENDIX O: Pilot Survey Results (8/5/10)

**Legend:**
- Strongly Agree = 4
- Agree = 3
- Disagree = 2
- Strongly Disagree = 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Avg. Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participation Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>EMPOWERMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td></td>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOW CHANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 4 4</td>
<td>4 3 4 3 4 3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>4 4 4 3 4 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I feel I am able to make a difference.</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 3 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I know how to design and implement a community service project.</td>
<td>2 0 2 1 2 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I try to understand the experiences of other people around the world.</td>
<td>3 4 3 3 4 3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I try to understand other people's point of view.</td>
<td>4 4 4 3 4 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I am able to understand other people's feelings.</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I have a more positive attitude about myself.</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I feel confident sharing my opinions in a group setting.</td>
<td>3 3 4 4 4 3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Because of buildOn, my classmates respect me more.</td>
<td>2 3 3 3 2 2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I can stand up for my opinion even if my friends disagree.</td>
<td>3 4 4 4 3 3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>3 4 3 3 1 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>4 3 3 3 3 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>4 3 4 3 3 3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td>4 4 4 4 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b</td>
<td>4 4 4 3 4 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b</td>
<td>4 3 4 3 4 3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I can organize other students to take action on a social problem.</td>
<td>1 0 1 1 3 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I first try to understand what the other person is saying before I decide how I will respond</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I work well with teammates</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td>buildOn has contributed to the feeling that I can make a difference.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I have hope that a better world is possible.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22a</td>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23a</td>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24a</td>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25a</td>
<td>BEFORE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22b</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23b</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24b</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25b</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26a</td>
<td>BEFORE NOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26b</td>
<td>BEFORE NOW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27a</td>
<td>BEFORE NOW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27b</td>
<td>BEFORE NOW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>I think it's important to hear others' ideas even if I find their ideas very different from mine.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, I feel like I have a wider range of options for after high school.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Because of buildOn, school has become a more positive experience for me.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Being in buildOn has had an effect on my grades.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>It's okay if I don't take action to issues in my school or community, because it's not my responsibility.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning about other countries through buildOn has given me a changed perspective on issues in my local community.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX P: Conducting Focus Groups

Excerpted from *Reflect and Improve Tool Kit*, Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development

Group interviews are another way to collect information from many people. Most people are familiar with focus groups.

A focus group is a small-group gathering conducted specifically to collect information from the group members. During a focus group discussion, between 6 and 12 people, who are similar in one or more ways, are guided through a facilitated discussion on a clearly defined topic (Krueger and Casey, 2000).

The goal of any focus group is to promote self-disclosure among participants. Because a group, rather than an individual, is asked to respond to questions, dialogue tends to take on a life of its own. Participants “piggy-back” on the comments of others and add a richness to the dialogue that could not be achieved through a one-on-one interview.

Clarifying Expectations

The first role in planning a focus group is to clarify its purpose. What kind of information do you hope to gain from your focus group discussion? Do you want input about how an activity or event could be improved, or are you more interested in the activity's impact on the community? What specific information is needed? Your answers to these questions will help you decide whom to invite to participate in the focus group discussion.

Selecting Participants

Members of a focus group should have some characteristic in common. For example, the information you might need to collect might suggest that you need to conduct a focus group composed of middle-school girls. Even though participants in a focus group are similar in one or two desired characteristics, the group must also include enough diversity in other characteristics to provide an accurate portrayal of the group’s collective opinion. For example, the group might be composed of middle-school girls who represent the racial, ethnic, and economic diversity of the middle school’s population.

Getting People to Attend

Occasionally, people avoid using focus groups because they are afraid that the people they invite won’t show up. To ensure high attendance rates, begin by making personal contact with the people you wish to invite. This is often done through a telephone call or personal visit. For those who agree to attend, send a personal letter that confirms their participation and communicates the relevant details of the event. Then make a reminder phone contact the day before the event.

What Happens at the Focus Group Interviews?

Focus group interviews typically last no longer than 90 minutes and often take less time. In many instances, the actual “interview” is preceded by a snack or light meal. Focus groups can be conducted around a large table or with participants seated in a circle of chairs. Participants are typically given name tags. A moderator welcomes the group and asks a series of 6 to 10 open-ended questions, and an assistant moderator or recorder takes notes. The discussion is often tape recorded for later playback or transcription. It is important, however, to let participants know that they are being recorded.
Developing Questions for Focus Groups

An important step in preparing for the focus group interview is the development of a set of questions that encourage participants to respond and collect the information needed. Good questions sound conversational and natural. They are usually short, open-ended, and one-dimensional (i.e., they ask for only one piece of information at a time). Begin with an introductory question that will get people talking and make them feel comfortable. Gradually move into the topic you want them to discuss with a transition question that is followed by several key questions covering the major areas of interest.

The specific order in which the questions are asked is called the questioning route. A good questioning route has an easy beginning, flows logically and naturally from one question to another, and moves from the general to the specific. It is important to estimate the time required to exhaust the discussion on each question. These time estimates can be used to help manage the focus group discussion.

Moderating Focus Groups

Effective moderating requires preparation, mental discipline, and skill in facilitating group interaction. But first, moderators must believe that all participants have something to contribute to the discussion regardless of their education level, experience, or background. Moderators must listen attentively, with sensitivity, and try to understand the perspective of each participant. Lack of respect is quickly transmitted to participants and results in reduced contributions.

Tips for Conducting Good Interviews

- Use active listening skills – listen more, talk less.
- Maintain eye contact and use body language that says you are interested and nonjudgmental.
- Keep a neutral demeanor and try not to let your own opinions show.
- Probe when appropriate. Follow up with “Why? Say more about this” ... or “Please elaborate.”

Data Analysis

Data analysis consists of indexing, managing, and interpreting the pieces of information that are collected during the interview. Begin by coding or labeling the notes (or transcripts) of the session according to content. For example, all references to the publicity surrounding a community event could be labeled with the same code. Next, use scissors or word-processing software to collate the coded text into each category. Each category should be in a separate pile or section of the document. Finally, write a summary statement that is true of each extract or piece of text in the pile or group. These statements often become key themes that are communicated in your evaluation report.
APPENDIX Q: Conducting Key-Informant Interviews

Excerpted from Reflect and Improve Tool Kit, Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development

A key informant is someone who, because of his or her unique position in a community, can provide you with important information about your community-building effort. Some key informants have first-hand knowledge of the community-building effort and can provide you with their own assessment of what is occurring. Others have access to information that would be difficult for you to obtain without their participation. In such cases, key informants pass along that information to you, often with an interpretation of what the data might mean. The use of key informants is a relatively simple and inexpensive means of collecting information.

Identifying Key Informants

Every community-building effort has a unique set of key informants. Key informants can be teachers, elected officials, youth, community leaders, agency staff, parents, and even funders.

Begin by asking the question, “Who in my community is in a position to provide me with information about how the community-building effort is working?” Then make a list of the key informants relevant to your community-building effort.

Next, decide who among the members of your project team would be the most appropriate person (or persons) to interview the key informants. Some members of the team might have better access to particular informants than others. Those team members should then make an appointment to conduct a face-to-face or telephone interview with each key informant.

If the key informant will need to gather any information from his or her records before the interview, it is good to state that in advance.

Questions

Before the interview, know what type of information you want from the key informant you are interviewing. Take some time before the interview to write down the questions you plan to ask.

One approach is to write some key questions to cover each of the important topics, then a couple of potential follow-up questions for each key question. Ask factual questions about a particular topic first, then the opinion questions. Be sure to write open-ended rather than “yes-no” questions. The goal is to be specific with questioning while allowing enough flexibility for open discussion.

Interviewing

Interviews should be structured, yet conversational. Begin by making the key informant comfortable. Tell him or her the purpose of the interview and provide assurance that the information will only be used for making judgments about the community-building effort. Because of the nature of the information key informants provide, it is often difficult to ensure their anonymity. In many cases, the key informant is the only person who could have provided a particular piece of information. (That is why they are key informants!) Make sure the key informant is comfortable with the way you plan to use the information you collect.
Maintain a neutral attitude throughout the interview. Don't try to defend your community-building project or argue with the key informant’s assessment of a situation. Be prepared to probe or use follow-up questions to gather additional information that might clarify why the key informant sees the situation as he or she does. Be sure to take detailed notes – they are essential to accurate analysis.

**Data Analysis**

Responses from the key informants are typically reviewed and analyzed to identify key themes as well as divergent viewpoints. This analysis may be best accomplished by a meeting of all interviewers in which everyone shares information from his or her interview(s).
There are over 1,000,000 registered public charities in operation in the United States today (as of January 2010).
  o Of those, nearly 22,000 (21,897) have a mission of youth development, and 330 focus specifically on youth development through community service.¹

In 2008, $284.99 billion was made in charitable contributions.²

Donors are increasingly looking for evidence of programmatic impact as a means of making funding decisions.³

A number of projects and organizations have been formed in recent years for the express purpose of developing and improving nonprofit impact measurement⁴:

Major foundations are providing tools and white papers for their grantees to evaluate the impact of their programs⁵⁶:

buildOn is funded primarily through individual donations (25%) and foundations and corporations (39%)⁷, but is looking to increase funding from foundations and government⁸.

buildOn’s foundation and government donors are not satisfied with output statistics (hours served, graduation rates, etc.); they want to see more rigorous evidence of the organization’s impact.⁹

Foundation and government donors identified by buildOn as potential funders are particularly concerned with metrics of academic success as a means of demonstrating impact:
  o **Robin Hood Foundation** focuses on graduation rates and standardized test scores to estimate increased earnings potential.¹⁰

---

⁸ Conversation with Carrie Pena, buildOn Director of Communications, 7.19.2010.
⁹ Conversation with Carrie Pena, buildOn Director of Communications, 7.19.2010.
The goal of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation’s education strategy for high school students is college readiness, as measured by high school graduation and college attendance rates.

The Department of Education’s focus on standardized test results is largely a legacy of the No Child Left Behind Act, which measures achievement in terms of reading and math proficiency.

Implications

- Donors are using metrics of academic achievement to evaluate the success of youth programs.
- Most of the youth programs being funded by academic-achievement-oriented donors have educational improvement as a central piece of their mission.
- buildOn’s mission of civic engagement and empowerment means that it will have difficulty demonstrating a direct link between its programming and academic gains.
- If buildOn intends to pursue funding from donors focused on academic achievement metrics, it will need to consider whether academic achievement should be an explicit program goal.
- In the short-term, buildOn should rely on the links between its core competencies and academic achievement to demonstrate impact to those donors.
- In the long-term, buildOn should consider:
  - Piloting collection of transcripts to assess academic achievement of students in the program, and;
  - Tracking alumni to assess their academic progress after high school.

---

## APPENDIX S: Workplan for Survey Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Evaluation Planning &amp; Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select program sites for sample set</td>
<td>• To identify the representative schools whose program participants will be among the 425 – 625 student sample set</td>
<td>• Review list of program sites according to selection criteria (size, demographics, years active in the program)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to staff training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designate point person in charge of evaluation logistics in Year 1</td>
<td>• To identify whose role it will be to coordinate collecting and analyzing the surveys, and answering PCs’ questions</td>
<td>• Point person self-selects from among the buildOn management, OR the opportunity is publicized among buildOn staff in order to select someone interested in the role</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to staff training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide on protocol for tabulating and analyzing survey results</td>
<td>• To prepare ahead of time for instructing staff on participating program sites on how they should tabulate the pre- and post-survey results (i.e., enter the results into SurveyMonkey)</td>
<td>• Determine who will tabulate the surveys: alternate PCs within regions, regional staff, or HQ staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to staff training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Staff Training | • Generate staff buy-in for implementing the evaluation | • Design content of staff training | | First week of school (Aug./Sept.) | • Begin to instill a sense of the importance of program evaluation among buildOn staff  
• Ensure that all Program Coordinators (PCs) understand how to administer the pre- and post-surveys  
• Ensure that all PCs and regional staff understand how to tabulate the survey results  
• Invite staff from participating program sites to take part in the training  
• Conduct training  
• Explain to staff the suggestion of a “New Member” or “Program Evaluation Officer” among the youth leadership team  
• Have staff at each participating site decide whether they will institute the new officer position or use another way to ensure a high response rate for the pre-survey |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design new SurveyMonkey templates</th>
<th>• To prepare an online version of the pre- and post-surveys for tabulating the written survey results. (NOTE: Due to slight changes in the content of the pre- and post-surveys, buildOn needs to create two SurveyMonkey surveys – one for the pre-survey and one for the post-survey.)</th>
<th>• Sign up for a SurveyMonkey Pro account (if buildOn does not have one already)</th>
<th>First week of school (Aug./Sept.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribute e-version of the pre- and post-surveys to program sites in the sample set for the new member “Welcome Packets”</td>
<td>• For staff at each participating program site to print the pre-surveys and compile their “Welcome Packets” for the upcoming school year’s program participants.</td>
<td>• Inform staff ahead of time at participating sites that they will be receiving e-copies of the pre- and post-surveys. • Instruct staff to print the pre-surveys and compile them, with a parent permission slip (for program participation AND for completing in the survey), into Welcome Packets</td>
<td>First week of school (Aug./Sept.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. Data Collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administer pre-survey</th>
<th>• To gather baseline data on students’ attitudes, knowledge, and behavior prior to participating in the program</th>
<th>• Distribute pre-surveys to all participating students (including returning participants) as they attend their first buildOn meeting or event • Collect pre-surveys and signed parental permission slips, potentially with the assistance of the New Member/Program Evaluation Officer • NOTE: PCs should make it clear to program participants that receiving the pre-survey and parent permission slip is a prerequisite to further participation in the program.</th>
<th>PCs Ongoing, until the end of the first semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tabulate pre-survey results</td>
<td>• To store pre-survey data for comparison with post-survey data at the end of the school year</td>
<td>• Ensure that all staff persons in charge of tabulating results have access to the online SurveyMonkey pre-survey each</td>
<td>Ongoing, until the end of the first semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Due</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer post-survey</td>
<td>• To gather data on students’ attitudes, knowledge, and behavior after they have participated in the program</td>
<td>PCs</td>
<td>End of the school year (May/June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announce to program participants that they will be asked to perform &quot;service to buildOn&quot; in the form of an end-of-the-year reflection meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added incentives for attending this meeting may be built in, such as food or the chance to win a gift card.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer post-surveys first, and encourage participants to be thoughtful and to take their time while completing them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish the meeting with any other types of reflection or celebration about the year’s accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabulate post-survey results</td>
<td>• To upload post-survey data for comparison with pre-survey data</td>
<td>No later than one month after the end of the school year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter all data from post-surveys into the online SurveyMonkey post-survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Download results in Excel format and save to a central server.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Data Analysis and Storage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compare pre- and post-survey data</td>
<td>• To analyze changes in students’ attitudes, knowledge, and behavior from before and after participating in the afterschool program</td>
<td>Staff member assigned to data analysis OR graduate student intern</td>
<td>No later than two months after the end of the school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using SurveyMonkey, calculate the following information:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average response per outcome (pre-survey) – i.e., “strongly disagree = 1,” “disagree = 2,” “agree = 3,” and “strongly agree = 4.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average response per outcome (post-survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Cross tabulation” (a feature of SurveyMonkey Pro) to analyze the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Statistical analysis (SPSS or STATA): optional | • To analyze the statistical significance (i.e., scientific validity) of the changes | • Upload Excel data into SPSS or STATA and run a T-test.  
• If buildOn would like to look for covariance between different characteristics (e.g., gender, grade level, or re-running SurveyMonkey's analysis of level of involvement), run a Logit test. | Staff member with statistics training OR graduate student intern |
| Data storage | • To store the evaluation results for comparison with future years' results | • Save the Excel files in an easily accessible location, such as on buildOn's server  
• Maintain printed, hard copies of the Excel files | |

### IV. Reporting & Using Results

| Evaluation report | • To summarize the evaluation findings in a succinct report for stakeholders to read | • Review evaluation results to decide the most relevant to include in the report  
• Write the report | Prior to the start of the next school year |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present evaluation results to buildOn staff</th>
<th>Present evaluation results to youth participants: optional</th>
<th>Publish results</th>
<th>Prior to the start of the next school year</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To initiate an organization-wide conversation about the evaluation findings, and how these findings reflect the program's strengths and areas for improvements</td>
<td>• Considered a &quot;best practice&quot; in the field of evaluation, feeding back the results of an evaluation to the participants in the program can allow evaluators to validate their data and ensure that the results reflect reality.</td>
<td>• To share the evaluation results with stakeholders, funders, and potential funders</td>
<td>• Present the results in a participatory manner that allows staff to respond and offer their feedback on the implications of the results for the program • Record staff feedback so that buildOn's leadership can use this information to make decisions on any adjustments to the afterschool program.</td>
<td>Prior to the start of the next school year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX T: buildOn Presentation Staff Feedback

August 18th, 2010

What would you need from your team in order to implement Step 1 (Pre and Post Surveys)?

- Overall buy-in and good energy
- Implementation plan
- Veteran/consistent Program Coordinators and Schools, because it is overwhelming for new staff. So we need to be thoughtful about our selection
- For the organization to guide Program Coordinators through the process and not just send them off with evaluations and say “get them done”
- Second implementation plan and how to “sell” to students issues of self reporting and capturing “honest” data
- This is not going to be an easy process so buy-in is critical from all stakeholders and keeping the big picture objectives of the process in mind

How would the evaluation results be helpful in your work?

- It will be a great guide in helping me be more intentional in my work with youth. I know where I should be going with them (2x)
- The evaluation and data collected will underscore the impact and value of our work it should five stakeholders and potential stakeholders a quantitative, more importantly, a qualitative glimpse at how buildOn programs help empower youth and transform lives. Also, the comprehensive nature of your process will provide a much more, well comprehensive look at all aspects of our program impact. THANK YOU.
- Help with program development, strategic planning/ visioning
- Allocation of resources, making tough choices with outcomes in mind
- More intentional program
- A more clear idea of how to prioritize
- Common language for organizational discussion
- Clarifies how to talk about our work to stakeholders
- Improve our program quality

What is your greatest concern about implementing the evaluation recommendations?

- Resources and supplies
- Gathering data from comparison groups (3x)
- Figuring out how to track/capture alumni and long-term outcomes specifically the technology and tools
- My concern is that it won’t be an on-going conversation/priority
- Incorporating in existing responsibilities as to be effective without overwhelming staff, students, etc...
- Once we get results, then what? How will this impact the organization and our mission? Not just how will the serve appeals to donors? What is our timeline for implementation?
• That we may as an organization focus too much on grades/GPA and begin to track those instead of learning and showing how what we already do has a positive impact on academic engagement

Any additional thoughts?

• Thank you for making the distinction between “academic success” and “academic engagement”
• This was extremely helpful and eye opening. Thank you all for your thoughtful work
• Very helpful and insightful. Thank you for all your hard work
• I loved the presentation. You guys did awesome
• It was great working with you through the summer. I gained a lot from you and appreciate all your thoughtful insights and hard work
• This was very impressive and educational. It looked like you all dedicated an enormous amount of care and intellect to this project
• Thank you for your very thorough and invested analyses. And for such practical, concrete and meaningful recommendations
• If you were buildOn alumni, we could say: SEE! This is how successful our members become!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>KAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>My grades have increased over the past year</td>
<td>Academic Engagement</td>
<td>AYPF</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>I feel I have something to contribute in class</td>
<td>Academic Engagement</td>
<td>AYPF</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>I feel like I have a wide range of options for after high school</td>
<td>Academic Engagement</td>
<td>Heller</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>School is a positive experience for me</td>
<td>Academic Engagement</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>It is very important for me to do the best I can in school</td>
<td>Academic Engagement</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>I can develop ideas about how to take action on a problem in the community</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>buildOn has contributed to the feeling that I can make a difference</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>buildOn</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>I know how to design and implement a community service project</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>UCBerkeley</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>I believe I have enough influence to impact community decisions</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>UCBerkeley</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>I know what resources are available to help me with a project in my school or community</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>UCBerkeley</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>It’s okay if I don’t take action to issues in my school or community, because it’s not my responsibility</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Doing things that help improve the community is an important job for everyone</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>I feel like I am an important part of my community</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>CYC</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>I feel that it is my responsibility to be actively involved in community issues</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>CYC</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>I try to understand the experiences of other people in my community and around the world</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>CYC</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>I try to understand other people’s point of view</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Urban Ministry</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>I am confident in my ability to succeed</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>CYC</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>I believe the path my life will take is outside my control.</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Heller</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Schwarzer &amp; Jerusalem</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d</td>
<td>I know how to handle unforeseen situations.</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Schwarzer &amp; Jerusalem</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e</td>
<td>I’m not discouraged when I’m confronted with a problem because I can usually think of several solutions</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Schwarzer &amp; Jerusalem</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>I am able to recognize issues of inequality locally and globally</td>
<td>Expanded Awareness</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>I want to learn more about other cultures</td>
<td>Expanded Awareness</td>
<td>buildOn</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>Learning about other countries through buildOn has given me a changed perspective on issues in my local community.</td>
<td>Expanded Awareness</td>
<td>Heller</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>I know other people who care about the same social issues that I do</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>CSCE</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>I have hope that a better world is possible</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Heller</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>The problems in my community are too big to ever be solved</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Heller</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>I know how to disagree without starting a fight or argument</td>
<td>Leadership &amp; Teamwork</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>I can organize other students to take action on a social problem</td>
<td>Leadership &amp; Teamwork</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c</td>
<td>I can persuade other students that a problem in my community needs to be solved</td>
<td>Leadership &amp; Teamwork</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9d</td>
<td>If I had to describe buildOn in 1-2 minutes to people who weren't familiar with the program, I would be comfortable doing so</td>
<td>Leadership &amp; Teamwork</td>
<td>Heller</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9e</td>
<td>I think it's important to hear others' ideas even if I find their ideas very different from mine.</td>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>I can set and achieve goals</td>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>buildOn</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>I look forward to trying new things</td>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>buildOn</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>I stand up for my opinion even if my friends disagree</td>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>AYPF</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>I feel that I have a number of good qualities</td>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>Rosenberg</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDICATOR SOURCES**

**AYPF** American Youth Policy Forum

**CYC** Center for Youth & Communities ([http://cyc.brandeis.edu/](http://cyc.brandeis.edu/)) – documents provided by Heller School staff and researchers

**CSCE** California Survey of Civic Education ([http://www.civicsurvey.org/CERG_California_Survey.html](http://www.civicsurvey.org/CERG_California_Survey.html))

**buildOn** buildOn Staff (Heller Team Workshop) or current questionnaire

**Carnegie** Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Political Engagement

**CIRCLE** CIRCLE ([http://www.civicyouth.org/practitioners/Core_Indicators_Page.htm](http://www.civicyouth.org/practitioners/Core_Indicators_Page.htm))

**Coopersmith** Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory
Heller Heller TCP Team

Healthy Kids Healthy Kids Survey (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/west/pdf/REL_2007034.pdf)

Gallup Gallup Student Poll (http://www.gallupstudentpoll.com/home.aspx)


SOS Summer of Service Evaluation Questions v.4

IYS Iowa Youth Survey (http://www.iowayouthsurvey.org)


Rosenburg The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

UCBerkeley UC Berkeley Service-Learning Center
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