



# Learning to Give

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT  
Overview & Recommendations

2000-2003

MICHIGAN STATE  
UNIVERSITY

Advancing Knowledge.  
Transforming Lives.



# Learning to Give

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT  
Overview & Recommendations

2000-2003

Overview by Robert L. Church

With the MSU Evaluation Team

Robert E. Floden

Leah R. Kirell

Brian D. Silver

Mark I. Wilson

Edward W. Wolfe

Diane L. Zimmerman

MICHIGAN STATE  
UNIVERSITY

Advancing Knowledge.  
Transforming Lives.



# Learning to Give

## FINAL EVALUATION REPORT Overview & Recommendations

2000-2003

### Overview by

**Robert L. Church**

*Vice Provost Emeritus, University Outreach and Engagement  
Professor Emeritus, Educational Administration*

### With the MSU Evaluation Team

**Robert E. Floden**

*Professor, Teacher Education;  
Director, Institute for Research on Teaching and Learning*

**Leah R. Kirell**

*Research Assistant, Teacher Education*

**Brian D. Silver**

*Professor, Political Science;  
Institute for Public Policy & Research*

**Mark I. Wilson**

*Associate Professor, Geography;  
Institute for Public Policy & Research*

**Edward W. Wolfe**

*Assistant Professor  
Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Special Education*

**Diane L. Zimmerman**

*Director, Administration and Advancement  
University Outreach & Engagement*



**MICHIGAN STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

Advancing Knowledge.  
Transforming Lives.

*University Outreach  
& Engagement  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing  
September 2003*

Copies of this overview report and the full 1997-2003 evaluation report of **Learning to Give** are available from:

**University Outreach & Engagement**

Michigan State University  
Kellogg Center, Garden Level  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
Voice: (517) 353-8977  
Fax: (517) 432-9541  
E-mail: [outreach@msu.edu](mailto:outreach@msu.edu)  
Web: <http://outreach.msu.edu>

© 2003 Michigan State University.  
All rights reserved.

The views expressed are solely those of the authors.

For more information about this report, contact Diane L. Zimmerman, Ph.D., at the above address or phone number, or e-mail: [zimmerdl@msu.edu](mailto:zimmerdl@msu.edu)  
Phone: (517) 353-8977  
Fax: (517) 432-9541.  
Email: [zimmerdl@msu.edu](mailto:zimmerdl@msu.edu)

**Senior Editor**

Diane L. Zimmerman

**Production Editor**

Linda Chapel Jackson

**Graphic Design**

Cools & Currier, Inc.

**Funding**

This report was supported in part by a contract with the Council of Michigan Foundations and Michigan State University.

*Michigan State University is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity institution.*

# Contents

Introduction .....	1
Student Learning .....	2
Student Survey of Philanthropic Activity and Attitudes .....	2
Analysis of Student Work .....	5
Classroom Testing .....	7
Student Learning Summary .....	8
Teacher Experience .....	9
Journal of Teacher Motivations and Aspirations .....	9
Survey of Pilot Teachers Regarding Their Participation in the LTG Project .....	11
Long-Term Impact Survey .....	17
Teacher Outcomes Summary .....	17
Issues for Further Consideration .....	19
Curriculum .....	19
Evaluation .....	20
Closing Thoughts .....	22



# Introduction

The Learning to Give (LTG) Project seeks to help K-12 students understand the concepts of philanthropy, civic responsibility, and the common good. It is designed to encourage them to develop ideas, skills, and projects that build character and instill positive attitudes and behaviors toward citizenship and toward other people in their families, neighborhoods, schools, and communities. LTG is a thoughtfully complex project employing a comprehensive set of strategies: curriculum development, assessment, in-service teacher training, pilot testing and field testing, supplemental materials development, evaluation, and dissemination through web-based presentation.

This report summarizes the results of the MSU team's evaluations of some of the activities that occurred in Phase II (June 2000-June 2003) and compares some of those results to findings gathered in the evaluations carried out in Phase I (August 1997 – May 2000) and summarized in our report of January 2001. The earlier evaluation, largely formative, focused on providing management information on the implementation of LTG. Teacher surveys and journals were used to assess the program's progress in creating, testing, and disseminating the LTG lessons and the impact that participation had on the teachers involved in lesson development and testing. The evaluation conducted for Phase II of the Project expanded the scope to include measures of LTG's impact on student understanding and on student participation in philanthropic activities.

The Phase II evaluation focused primarily on teachers and students in the Project's "pilot schools." Where in Phase I the LTG program engaged individual teachers scattered among many schools in developing and testing curriculum materials, in Phase II it identified a limited set of school buildings (designated as "pilot schools") that agreed to use LTG lessons at all grade levels in that building. School-wide implementation provided the evaluators the opportunity to begin an investigation of the longitudinal impact of the LTG lessons on student understanding and behavior and on teacher attitudes and strategies—something not possible earlier while LTG lessons were taught in scattered locations. Because actual implementation of the lessons did not start in most of the pilot schools until the second of the three years in Phase II, data collected in this evaluation period does not provide much longitudinal perspective and does not reflect a great deal of change between the accomplishments in 2001-2002 and those in 2002-2003. Rather, the whole of the data collected in Phase II will serve as a base for comparison with student and teacher accomplishments during Phase III of the Project.

This overview of the findings, with the corresponding recommendations, is drawn from and integrates materials from the evaluation data and reports prepared by MSU evaluators in two areas: student learning and teacher experience. The overview describes the research methodologies and the findings under each of the types of evaluation in those two areas and concludes with recommendations of issues for further consideration.

# Student Learning

The evaluation team conducted surveys of students and analyses of student work in several of the classes in the twelve “research schools” (a subset of the “pilot school” group). This research was designed to permit some assessment of school-level changes as well as changes in individual student understanding.<sup>1</sup> The brief surveys aimed to discover information about students’ attitudes towards philanthropy and their participation in and perceptions of community service. The evaluation of the work (essays, tests, projects, art) that the students completed as they were taught the LTG lessons sought to gauge the students’ understanding of concepts introduced and explicated in those lessons. Because the content being taught (e.g., the definition of philanthropy and how it relates to democratic participation) is unlikely to be covered elsewhere in the curriculum, the knowledge of philanthropy that students demonstrate in the survey and in their classwork can reasonably be attributed to their work with the LTG units.

During the three-year period ending in June of 2003, the evaluators conducted two surveys and reviews of student work, at the end of the 2001-2002 school year and the end of the 2002-2003 school year. In the 2000-2001 school year the pilot schools were just beginning to integrate the LTG lessons into the curriculum and too few of the students in those schools had experienced those lessons to make a general evaluation of student learning meaningful.

## Student Survey of Philanthropic Activity and Attitudes

### Methodology

Professor Robert Floden of MSU’s College of Education constructed this 15-question survey using questions adapted from the 1996 and 1999 telephone National Household Education Survey (NHES) and from Independent Sector’s “Measuring Volunteering Toolkit” published in 2000, coupled with some questions targeted at unique LTG goals such as students’ future plans for philanthropic activity. (For details see R. E. Floden, “Student Survey of Philanthropic Activity and Attitudes,” in full report.) The focus of these survey questions is on action (i.e., “What did you do?”), not just on knowledge (i.e., “What did you learn?”).

Drawing from the earlier surveys allowed the evaluators to use items already pilot tested and to compare responses from students who had experienced the LTG materials to responses from a nationally representative sample of students who had not. It is not possible, of course, to attribute all of the differences to the LTG experience since they may just as readily reflect variance in student background or school environment.

<sup>1</sup> The evaluators also tried to gauge such impact through interviewing (via telephone) administrators at pilot schools to gather their assessment of the impact that the adoption of the lessons on a school-wide basis might have had on school climate; piloted toward the end of the 2001-2002 school year, this methodology proved unworkable in terms of response rate and administrator knowledge of the program at this early stage of school-wide adoption and was not repeated at the end of the 2002-2003 school year. The evaluation design for the next phase of the LTG Project calls for a more complex probe of the issue of LTG and changes in school climate.

Because this written survey was not considered appropriate for young children, it was administered only to students in grades 6-12 in the pilot school research sample. The first survey (spring of 2002) resulted in 517 completed surveys (from 18 teachers across 7 schools) while the second administration (spring 2003) brought in only 222 (from 10 teachers across 5 schools). These numbers (and the fact that 70 of the 2003 surveys could not be used because the parental consent form had not been completed) reminds us of the difficulties of collecting student data from busy teachers working in busy classrooms. High school students (grades 9-12) were poorly represented in both surveys (37 in 2002; 39 in 2003). Therefore, middle and high school responses were analyzed as a single group. (Note: The student survey instrument and consent form appear in Appendix A of the full LTG evaluation report.)

## Findings

Responses from the two surveys are quite comparable and, taken together, provide a baseline for later analysis of these students when they have experienced the LTG lessons over a multi-year period. Significant increases in student participation and commitment to philanthropy and service after, say, four years of a pilot school's participation in LTG would strongly suggest that student interaction with the LTG materials were at least in part responsible for the changes. The time span of this evaluation did not allow for such a perspective.

In both years a large majority of the students surveyed indicated that they had, during the current school year, "participated in community service activity or volunteer work" at their school or in their community (89% in 2002; 87% in 2003). While these figures are well above the rate of participation of the NHES respondents (52%), they are lower than expected since the pilot schools are supposed to provide a service-learning component in their LTG classes. It is not clear why more than 10% of the respondents did not acknowledge a service activity. In 2002 it was thought that during the earlier implementation of the LTG lessons, not all teachers were able to engage all students in a service activity; perhaps that difficulty continues. The concern is reinforced by the data from Professor Silver's teacher survey (see Table 14 in B. D. Silver, "Pilot Teacher Survey 2003," in full report), showing that a good number of LTG teachers, whatever their school's policy, do not feel that the service-learning component is very important. This issue bears further investigation. Perhaps those students answering the questions did not, for some reason, believe that their LTG service-learning experience fit the question's parameters. It may be that "service learning" in the survey questions is too narrow a term and that more are participating in service than answers to those questions indicate. But the fact that the pilot school students participate in service and volunteer work at nearly twice the rate of the national sample is almost surely a result of their school's participation in LTG.

In addition, approximately two-thirds (64% in 2002; 66% in 2003) of the total number of respondents said that they had given money or objects (clothes, toys, food, or books) to a charity within the last month. A very small number (7% in 2002; 3% in 2003) said that they had never given. Large majorities of respondents in both years indicated that they were motivated to help others because they saw it was important to help others in need. Further, 89% in 2002 and 94% in 2003 said they would like to volunteer or donate in the future. Almost half the respondents "would most like to help" people—as opposed to "animals," "the environment or nature," or "organizations, such as a school, church, community, or political organization."

*[Students] understood the vocabulary of philanthropy and have learned to think of how they can contribute as philanthropists. They also became more aware of how often they are recipients of other people's "time, talent, and treasure," and that they have a responsibility to reciprocate.*

*-- Pilot teacher*

Table A below summarizes the length and intensity of student participation in service or volunteer activities. In the 2003 survey students reported participating in service for fewer weeks but for more hours each week as compared to those reporting the previous year. In terms of the length of their service activity, 47% of those who reported being engaged in a community service activity or volunteer work in 2002 indicated that they were involved on “a regular basis” (as opposed to “once or twice”) but fewer (35%) reported regular involvement in 2003. Similarly, a quarter of the 2002 respondents but more than a third of the 2003 respondents reported participation lasting only one week; another quarter of the 2002 were engaged for two weeks (33% in 2003); while participation for longer time periods waned correspondingly. The national sample showed 9% participating for one week, 9% for two weeks, and 23% for three or four weeks. In the national sample 16% indicated participation for more than 12 weeks compared to 6% of the 2003 and 12% of the 2002 LTG students. Note that these participation rates are for those that indicate involvement in service or volunteer activity during the year. LTG students participate at almost twice the rate of the national sample; with that broader participation comes some diminution of intensity among participants. That middle school students were overrepresented in the LTG survey as compared to the NHES research may also account for the higher number of LTG students serving short time periods. At the higher levels of participation, however, LTG students closely resemble the national sample: 8% of the national sample (all respondents, not just those indicating that they participated in service) were engaged for more than twelve weeks, compared to between 10% (2002) and 5% (2003) of all LTG students surveyed (figures not shown in Table A).

**Table A**

**Intensity of Involvement Among Those Students  
Indicating Participation In Community Service**

	<b>LTG Students 2002</b>	<b>LTG Students 2003</b>	<b>NHES Student Survey</b>
Percent participating “this year”	89%	87%	52%
Percent of those participating regularly rather than “once or twice”	47%	35%	44%
Percent serving for			
1 week	25%	33%	9%
2 weeks	25%	33%	9%
3-4 weeks	25%	20%	23%
5-8 weeks	7%	6%	26%
9-12 weeks	7%	1%	16%
More than 12 weeks	12%	6%	16%
Percent serving for			
Less than 3 hours per week	63%	38%	48%
3-5 hours per week	25%	40%	33%
More than 5 hours per week	13%	22%	19%

In contrast, in 2003 students reported spending more hours on service during their weeks of participation than was reported in 2002. Of the 2003 respondents who did participate in service, 62% reported spending more than three hours each week doing so, as opposed to 38% in 2002. Twenty-two percent participated for more than five hours per week in 2003, while 13% did so in 2002. The comparable national figures were 48% for involvement for fewer than three hours and

19% for involvement for more than five hours. Of course, given the limited sample size it is unclear whether these variations between the results obtained in the two years actually signify change or are merely random.

The evaluators were particularly concerned about a finding in the 2002 survey which indicated that about half of those participating in a service or volunteer activity did not learn about the effects of their project. It was felt that such lack of feedback did not reinforce students' commitment to service. Further reflection suggested that in 2002 the survey item itself was flawed in that it forced the respondents to choose one of two fairly formal methods of obtaining feedback (asking recipients or conducting a written survey) or to indicate that they did not learn about the effects at all. In the 2003 survey the forced choice question was replaced with an open-ended one; 80% of the responses indicated that they learned something of the effect of their involvement. However, few responded to the second part of the item—about how they learned of the effects—suggesting that they or their teachers and mentors seldom made systematic or distinct efforts to assess the impact of the activity. As Professor Floden writes (R. E. Floden, "Student Survey of Philanthropic Activity and Attitudes," in full report):

*Given the increased national attention to being accountable and measuring effects, this result may reflect a broader national need to combine philanthropic efforts with systematic scrutiny of their impact. This need is already reflected in Learning to Give objectives, which include attention to evaluation of results of philanthropic activity ... . Perhaps such a skill is beyond what teachers, especially in middle school, are able to develop in their students during the time they have to devote to the Learning to Give units. Learning how to assess results, beyond the sense of accomplishment during the activity and the spontaneous gratitude of those served, is [a] relatively sophisticated area of student learning, perhaps something to be addressed later in the development of the Project.*

## Analysis of Student Work

### Methodology

Student work samples completed during LTG lessons were collected for the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 school years. Using a rubric created after extensive testing, Professor Floden and Research Assistant Leah Kirrell examined student essays, tests, worksheets, pictures, posters, and other student created artifacts (see L. R. Kirell and R. E. Floden, "Student Outcomes July 2003," in full report). From the 2001-2002 school year they analyzed 75 sets of student work; in the most recent year they examined 136.<sup>2</sup> In both years the number of work samples from grades 9-12 was very low—five in 2001-2002 and six in 2002-2003. Grades 3-5 were most heavily represented, especially in 2002-2003.

<sup>2</sup> *In the 2001-2002 cycle it was decided that the samples of student work from grades 1-2 were so lacking in written work that analysis was unjustified; in 2002-2003 the evaluators did apply the scoring rubric to the work of 15 sets of work from the first and second grades (these 15 are not included in the 136). Although the scores were encouraging—with ten students at the highest level—it was difficult to score work comprised mostly of artwork and the conclusions are therefore quite tenuous.*

## Findings

The analysis focused on the degree to which students were able to demonstrate their understanding of the content of the LTG lesson. Those at the highest level are able to expand on the lesson's concepts and apply them in their daily lives. Students at the second level are able to express the concepts in original and appropriate ways within the confines of the lesson plan. Student work is assigned to the third level—"limited understanding"—when the student's responses are primarily repetitious or rote. Those whose production indicates lack of understanding of the concepts are placed in the fourth level. Approximately 15% of the samples were not scored because the materials could not be deciphered or did not address issues of philanthropy.

In both years 73% of the students were judged to have understood the concepts well. Their work demonstrated either that they applied the lesson content "appropriately beyond classroom context" or "appropriately within classroom context." However, more of the 2001-2002 samples of student work (40%) were placed in the first level while only 26% of the 2002-2003 samples were so designated. And while 33% of the 2001-2002 samples were placed in the second level ("appropriately within classroom context"), 47% of the 2002-2003 samples were. This shift between the first two levels appears to have occurred because the teachers and the lessons asked the students to master more, and more complex, concepts. In 2001-2002, the first year of experience with the LTG lessons for most of the students and teachers, all grade levels necessarily focused on introductory concepts—the definition of philanthropy and identification of the kinds of organizations that carry it out. The student work was evaluated against those goals.

Those objectives remained important in each of the lessons and students showed their ability to meet and exceed them. The students in 2002-2003 continued to show the mastery of the definition of philanthropy—the giving of time, talent, or treasures. Younger students focused on how they personally can give in each of these categories. A third grader asserts: "I'm going to be a philanthropist by putting on a play for the people at the nursing home. I'm giving my time and talent." Appropriately, older students express a more developed, sophisticated understanding, applying the concepts not only to their own actions and potential actions but to the activities of characters in literature and history.

Much of the collected student work demonstrated that, as the evaluators wrote (L. R. Kirell and R. E. Floden, "Student Outcomes July 2003" in full report),

*Students' understanding of the definition and application of philanthropy has developed beyond mere rote knowledge and direct application in their own lives to encompass an awareness of the motives and effects of philanthropic action. Unfortunately not many of the teachers' assignments asked students to apply the lessons' concepts to their own lives and few asked students to integrate or synthesize philanthropy objectives; this was especially true at the higher grades. When asked, students seemed capable of doing so.*

Student work suggests that students have understood that philanthropic activities not only aid others but also increase their own sense of pride in themselves and in their community. As one student wrote:

*Giving to the less fortunate can be easy with help. Working with friends can make the job fun and go by more quickly. That is just one of the reasons I give back to my community. Other reasons I give back to my community are to make me proud because I made it a more beautiful place to live and it makes me proud of myself.*

Asked to describe a world without philanthropy, an assignment in a number of classrooms, students overwhelmingly argued that human and environmental suffering would increase. Students demonstrated understanding of community and the common good, with age determining the sophistication of that understanding. For younger students schools, homes, and local neighborhoods comprise community; older students increasingly see the world as a single community.

The 2001-2002 cycle analysis demonstrated that students were learning the close relationship between philanthropic principles and the Core Democratic Values (CDVs) that form an important aspect of standardized tests in Michigan. The evaluators noted that the LTG materials appeared to be useful in reinforcing the CDVs, which are a strong focus of the state's social studies curriculum. The evaluators warned that the small number of high school responses in that cycle made it "difficult to know whether this trend is a general one in the higher grades." The CDVs were not a focus in this year's evaluation because very little of the student work submitted for review came from lessons on that topic.

*Older students are able to apply the definition of philanthropy not only to their own actions but also to those of people they are studying in history or literature.*

The two years of review of student work demonstrate that students of all ages correctly define philanthropy and know how to behave philanthropically; they understand the concepts of community and the common good and can locate, and explain the mission of, philanthropic organizations in their community. Their mastery of the curricular objectives—of understanding the difference between for-profit and nonprofit organizations in the community, of explaining the purpose of corporate philanthropy, and defining volunteerism—was a good deal more variable. In these areas, while many students fully met the objectives, others were unable to meet any of them. A large number of the samples suggest that the students were returning memorized or rote definitions without quite understanding the difference between a for-profit and a nonprofit enterprise or the motivations for corporate philanthropy. Clearly students have had exposure to the concepts but their mastery of the material is variable. The evaluators suggest that these differences in accomplishment relate to the fact that these relatively advanced concepts are really being covered for the first time in the LTG lessons this year. It is also noteworthy that the 2002-2003 cycle saw the introduction of these more complex objectives, suggesting that the teachers feel more comfortable with the LTG program and are therefore more willing to push it into more demanding areas. That effort met with some success, as even on the topics with which students struggled the most there was evidence of some student learning. As the evaluators conclude, "Repeated exposure to the content is likely to yield greater student learning."

## Classroom Testing

The evaluation team at MSU as well as evaluation consultants working with the Project have been developing the components for a standardized testing strategy to be used in connection with the LTG lessons as a measure of student mastery of the content of those lessons. The MSU team has spent considerable effort during 2002-2003 honing and testing items constructed earlier and matching those items against LTG's list of primary content objectives (see E. W. Wolfe, "Test Development," in full report).

The bank of test items that had been developed by LTG subcontractors were carefully reexamined for clarity, item formatting, and item structure and many were revised on the basis of that analysis. LTG staff then reviewed the revisions and in some cases revised them further to insure that they fully captured the meaning of the content the item was meant to probe.

After that review the MSU evaluation team created three pilot tests (one for elementary students, one for middle school students, and one for high school students) of approximately 30 questions each which were then administered by LTG teachers and returned to Professor Wolfe in October 2002. Test items were selected to represent the range of LTG content and objectives and of question types (multiple choice, fill in, constructed response). The evaluators received at least 74 completed tests from elementary students, 109 from middle school students, and 109 from high school students.

The pilot testing indicated that students consistently found constructed response questions more difficult than the multiple choice items, indicating that further revision and/or a reconsideration of their role in the testing program are needed. Also, it became clear regarding the high school questions that their level of difficulty and/or their congruence with lesson content needed adjustment: on 14 of the 29 questions, not a single one of the 109 students taking the test gave a correct answer. Review and revision is continuing.

The remaining steps necessary to complete the test development process were then scheduled and initiated. LTG staff over the summer of 2003 reexamined the long list of student learning objectives that had been developed for the Project and identified the smaller number that merited the greatest emphasis in the questions to be included in the test forms. Using this prioritized list, the MSU staff worked to match the existing test items to the LTG objectives, a process that revealed the some of the important objectives were not reflected adequately in the existing bank of items.

In August of 2003 LTG staff, a group of LTG teachers, and the MSU staff met to review jointly the question bank and engage the LTG teachers in the process of writing additional questions to insure coverage of all the priority learning objectives. These questions will be completed and reviewed by the MSU test development staff by October 2003 when LTG will gather teachers and community members to review the questions for sensitivity and fairness. Then the MSU test developers will construct content-balanced field-test forms to be administered in early 2004. All of the more than 200 questions in the item bank will appear on one or more test forms so that a thorough item analysis can be conducted and final revisions can be completed during the summer of 2004, when the initial operational test forms will be created. During the 2004-2005 school year, these initial operational test forms will be administered and the test development staff will conduct a final validation study. Finished test forms will be delivered to LTG in June of 2005.

## Student Learning Summary

The evaluation of student learning has used three methods of assessment: reviewing student work from LTG lessons to judge their ability to understand and apply the lesson content, surveying LTG students to ascertain their attitudes toward and involvement in philanthropic and service activities, and administering standardized tests to determine the students' mastery of the lesson concepts. This latter method still has a year of developmental work before it can be used reliably; therefore, the Phase II evaluation relies on findings derived from the reviews of student work and the student surveys completed in both 2002 and 2003. The findings indicate that those engaged in studying the LTG lessons displayed strong mastery of the introductory concepts regarding philanthropy and the common good and good mastery of more advanced concepts. A very high percentage were able to apply the introductory concepts to their lives and experience beyond the classroom; fewer than half the students were able to do so with the more advanced topics. The review of student work also showed that in the second year (2003), students were much more likely to be dealing with advanced concepts than they had in the previous year. The surveys of attitude and involvement revealed that students were committed to sharing their time, talents, and treasures with others to advance the common good, that they intended to continue that commitment in the future. Students involved with the LTG program enact that commitment by engaging in volunteer community service at a much higher rate than did a national sample of students surveyed in 1999.

# Teacher Experience

Success of the curricular innovations offered by LTG depends finally on the willingness—or rather, the enthusiasm—of teachers to implement them with verve and imagination in their classrooms. The evaluation team has been collecting information since the beginning of the Project to assess what teachers expect of the LTG materials and their satisfaction with them once they begin to use them, and can thus trace some of the developments in teachers' attitudes and satisfaction over the years. In all the findings over this three-year period (2000-2003), teachers display high levels of enthusiasm for teaching philanthropy and civic engagement and high levels of satisfaction with the LTG materials and the support they receive from LTG staff. The evaluation team used three methods to learn more about the teachers' experience and satisfaction during this second phase of the evaluation: summer workshop journals, a survey of pilot teachers, and a long term impact survey.

*The lesson plans were wonderful and extremely clear.*

*-- Pilot teacher*

## Journal of Teacher Motivations and Aspirations

### Methodology

During the summers of 2001, 2002, and 2003 Professor Mark Wilson asked participants in LTG's summer workshops to provide written answers to six questions (see M. I. Wilson, "Teacher Journal Evaluations Summer 2003," in full report). The workshops are designed to aid the teachers in preparing to implement and improve LTG lessons in their classrooms. Each group of teachers reflected on their expectations and goals for their participation in the Project in their answers to the five open-ended questions (and one question on computer experience and competency) administered at the end of their workshop. Professor Wilson received 23 responses in 2001; 33 in 2002; and 30 in 2003. In addition, six Ferris State University students just beginning a master's program emphasizing education in philanthropy participated in 2002.

While the questions in these surveys were quite similar to those asked of LTG workshop participants during the first phase of the Project, it should be noted that the earlier journaling process asked teachers to reflect on their experience several times during their initial year of working with LTG. Teachers in Phase II responded only once, before most of them began using the LTG materials in their classrooms.

### Findings

Notable in the responses in Phase II was the growing evidence that many of the participants are being attracted to the LTG Project through word-of-mouth from colleagues and supervisors (and in at least one case a student teacher). The Project's visibility is increasing as its materials are used in more buildings and as its recruitment efforts—through newsletters, the website, and personal contacts—are more effective.

Otherwise teacher responses were generally similar over the three years. Participants explained their interest in LTG in terms of their own commitment to improving their communities, of their deep concern that their students develop a more adequate sense of the common good and commitment to contributing to it, and of their desire to grow more competent as professional educators. This desire for professional growth has become a more common response as the Project has matured. Also more common are references to a desire to develop proficiency in coupling content about philanthropy and citizenship with already existing service-learning activities in their schools. One teacher noted:

*My school is really involved in service learning. I've done a few shorter projects, but I want to do more and make what I do more substantive and curriculum based.*

While the word “philanthropy” appeared predominantly in journal discussions of motivation during Phase I of the Project, Phase II respondents more often described being concerned with learning and teaching about “community” and “citizenship.” The words “volunteerism” and “advocacy” seldom appeared. It is not clear how significant this shift to more general and abstract terms is; it could simply reflect changes in emphasis or vocabulary in the workshops themselves, or represent a reaction to growing national reform rhetoric about civic responsibility or even a response to the September 11 attacks. But it suggests, at least, that LTG is moving toward a somewhat broader focus toward civic responsibility of which philanthropy is a part rather than focusing on philanthropic giving alone.

The responses to the surveys make it abundantly clear that the participants are enthusiastically committed to using the LTG materials in their classrooms to improve their students’ understanding of their responsibility to share with others in order to enhance the common good. As one participant wrote:

*The whole concept of the “common good” is vital to the success of this country. As a teacher, it is my responsibility to assist our young in this direction.*

Teachers expected to use the LTG materials and approach to help children develop personal values:

*Too much of life revolves around self interest and personal acquisition that we must work to instill values that support community and the view of self as only a *part* of the whole.*

*I want to ignite the spark in [my young students] to always think of themselves as philanthropists. That image will enable them to be sensitive as they grow to all areas of service where their involvement will make a difference.*

*I have noticed less involvement of parents in the teaching of values and social interaction. Once children become aware of the needs of others, I find this effects a positive atmosphere in the classroom.*

Respondents expressed high levels of satisfaction with the LTG materials and with their workshop experience. In listing “factors or resources that would assist you as the Project continues,” teachers most often listed the need for more time to plan and research although the need for time was mentioned less frequently by the 2003 participants. They also expressed the wish that there would be more frequent and sustained interactions with LTG staff and other teachers using the materials—in follow-up workshops, video-conferences, and the like. Another frequently stated need was advice on grant writing.

# Survey of Pilot Teachers Regarding Their Participation in the LTG Project

## Methodology

In the spring of 2002 and the spring of 2003 Professor Brian Silver surveyed all the teachers in the pilot schools who had used the LTG materials during both semesters of that school year (see B. D. Silver, "Pilot Teacher Survey 2003," in full report). Professor Silver designed the survey "to evaluate the teachers' experiences in implementing and improving lessons from the LTG curriculum." Some of those surveyed had used LTG materials before the pilot school phase began (in 2001); some had just started their LTG work only in the spring of 2001 or the fall of 2002. This survey included many items that appeared in two surveys administered in 2000 to earlier cohorts of LTG teachers (the "Matrix" teachers who wrote lessons as part of their experience and the "Residential" group who moved into the program after attending an intensive summer workshop), thus providing comparisons over time of teachers' experience with and attitudes toward the materials, the adequacy of the support they received while using them, and their assessment of student reactions.

In 2002, 141 (71%) of the 191 teachers receiving the survey completed and returned it; in 2003, 178 received surveys and 108 (61%) completed them. Seventy-four of those 108 (68%) responded to both surveys. As is true of much of the data collected in this evaluation, survey responses are heavily weighted toward teachers in the lower grades, with no more than 15% of the responses coming from those who taught in grade six or above. Thus it is not possible to comment separately on teacher experience and assessment at the middle- and high-school levels. (The pilot school teacher survey and consent form are available in Appendix B of the full report.)

## Findings

The results of the two surveys administered in 2002 and 2003 were quite similar; the most telling differences are those between the pilot teachers' responses (Phase II) on the one hand and those of the Matrix and Residential cohorts (Phase I) on the other.

*I've always felt a part of our responsibility as educators is to help students grow in all areas, including being a caring, thoughtful citizen. Children feel useful and important when they give. In many homes/families, there are few opportunities for children to feel needed and useful.*

*-- Pilot teacher  
Learning to Give*

## Understanding

Most striking is the finding that, although the pilot school teachers had substantially less training in the meaning of philanthropy or in how to use the materials than those in the earlier cohorts, substantially higher percentages of them felt that they understood what was expected of them and that they understood the meaning of philanthropy as they started work in the Project. For example, 86% of the respondents in 2002 and 87% in 2003 reported that the LTG objectives were “very clear” while 44% and 39% of those surveyed earlier returned that response (Table 2 from B. D. Silver, “Pilot Teacher Survey 2003,” in full report). When asked how well they understood what was expected of them when they began their work with LTG, 38% in 2002 and 36% in 2003 marked “very well” while only 7% of the residential cohort did so (Table 5 from B. D. Silver, “Pilot Teacher Survey 2003,” in full report; this question was not asked of the Matrix teachers).

**Table 2**

“Overall, how clear are the objectives of Learning to Give?” (A3)

Teacher Cohort	Matrix (2000)	Residential Institute (2000)	Pilot 2002	Pilot 2003
Very clear	39	44	86	87
Somewhat clear	57	44	14	13
Not very clear	4	12	0	0
Not at all clear	0	0	0	0
Total Percent	101	100	100	100

Reprinted from: Silver, B. D. (2003, September). Pilot teacher survey 2003. In Learning to Give: Final Evaluation Report. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Office of the Assistant Provost for University Outreach & Engagement.

**Table 5**

“When you first began work on LTG, how well did you understand what was expected of you?” (B5)

Teacher Cohort	Matrix (2000)	Residential Institute (2000)	Pilot 2002	Pilot 2003
Very well	NA	7	38	36
Fairly well	NA	60	51	52
Not very well	NA	33	10	11
Total Percent	NA	100	100	99

Reprinted from: Silver, B. D. (2003, September). Pilot teacher survey 2003. In Learning to Give: Final Evaluation Report. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Office of the Assistant Provost for University Outreach & Engagement.

The pilot teachers received substantially less training than those in earlier cohorts. Nonetheless, around 90% of the pilot teachers reported that they felt “completely” or “mostly” confident that they had “adequate training for the task” of piloting the lessons. Approximately the same percentages of the earlier cohorts which experienced the more extensive training chose those responses. Positive responses in the 2003 survey were the highest ever (at 94%). When asked to judge how useful the in-service training was in preparing them to pilot the lessons, 85% in 2003 and 88% in 2002 considered it “very helpful” or “somewhat helpful”; however, more chose “somewhat” over “very”

(48% to 40% in 2002; 52% to 33% in 2003), suggesting some room for some improvement in the in-service offering. Several teachers commented that they would have appreciated more training, including demonstrations of one or more of the LTG lessons. Professor Silver’s analysis in 2002 revealed that teachers with more than ten years of experience were more satisfied with the training (and the Project as a whole). In evaluating the in-service, 80% of those with five or fewer years of experience rated it as “good” or “very good”; 94% of those with more than ten years experience did so. But most significant, a higher percentage of the pilot teachers felt prepared to pilot the lessons than did the residential teachers three years earlier—reflecting, we believe, improvements in the professional development program and the presence of other teachers in their schools who also participate in LTG and who can thus share ideas and strategies.

## Staff Support

The data gathered in this Phase also suggest that the pilot teachers needed less support from LTG staff and were more adept at finding support from “normal” sources—other teachers, school and public libraries (see Table 9 below, reprinted from B. D. Silver, “Pilot Teacher Survey 2003,” in full report).

**Table 9**

“How helpful are the following sources of information to your work for the project?” (B2)

Percent saying “Very useful” or “Somewhat useful” as opposed to “Not useful” or “Not at all useful”

Teacher Cohort	Matrix (2000)	Residential Institute (2000)	Pilot 2002	Pilot 2003
School library	64	56	72	79
Public library/other library	29	25	60	63
Newspapers/magazines	64	69	58	68
Other LTG teachers	89	94	72	76
Other teachers at my school	39	25	74	74
The Project webpage	71	63	61	68
The Internet generally	82	60	70	72
The Project information session	...	...	86	79
The Project in-service training	96	100	84	69
Communications with Project staff	86	94	81	76

Reprinted from: Silver, B. D. (2003, September). Pilot teacher survey 2003. In Learning to Give: Final Evaluation Report. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Office of the Assistant Provost for University Outreach & Engagement.

They were also more satisfied with the support and feedback they received from administrators and colleagues at their schools than were the earlier cohorts (see Table 10 below, reprinted from Silver). Thus, while their satisfaction with support, advice, and feedback from principals and department chairs is quite a bit lower than is satisfaction with support from colleagues, LTG staff, and students, the pilot teachers’ level of satisfaction with supervisory support is considerably higher

than it was in prior years—reflecting, it seems, the school-wide commitments to the Project. Further, given that each building has several teachers using the LTG materials, it seems appropriate that the teachers communicate with their peers more than with their supervisors when seeking support and advice.

**Table 10**

**“How satisfied are you with the amount of support, advice or feedback that you have received during the piloting of your lessons from the following people?” (B29)**

Percent saying “Very satisfied” or “Somewhat satisfied” as opposed to “Not very satisfied” or “Not at all satisfied”

Teacher Cohort	Matrix (2000)	Residential Institute (2000)	Pilot 2002	Pilot 2003
My principal	68	50	75	78
My department chair, lead teacher	50	40	66	64
Other LTG teachers	80	83	82	81
Other teachers at my school	68	67	83	79
The LTG Project staff	78	100	98	87
My students	96	100	97	96

Reprinted from: Silver, B. D. (2003, September). Pilot teacher survey 2003. In Learning to Give: Final Evaluation Report. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Office of the Assistant Provost for University Outreach & Engagement.

## Collaboration

Satisfaction with support from colleague teachers who were not participants in the LTG Project was also considerably higher than in prior years, presumably for the same reasons. When administrator interviews reinforce the finding suggested by Table 10 above that LTG participation was encouraging the sharing of lesson plans and supplemental materials. When asked with whom they discussed their project activities, 82% (in 2002) and 77% (2003) of the respondents reported having such discussions with their colleagues in their building “frequently” or “sometimes,” and 64% and 71% reported periodic discussion with LTG teachers elsewhere. These percentages were far higher than reports of discussions with principals, supervisors, and the LTG staff. These two groups of colleagues were also cited (Table 9) as being “very” or “somewhat” useful by approximately three-quarters of the respondents.

## Curriculum and Curriculum Materials

The survey featured several questions that probed pilot teacher opinions of the LTG lessons that they implemented. In both 2002 and 2003 respondents gave the materials very high marks. When asked, “How complete were the lesson plans prior to your piloting the lessons in your classroom?”, 69% in 2003 chose “complete” (60% in 2002) and another 30% (38% in 2002) chose “mostly complete” with the remainder choosing “not very complete.” Asked to rate the “lessons I’ve used,” 58% in 2003 (51% in 2002) chose “very good” while another 41% (46% in 2002) chose “good.” Thus 97-99% of those using the lessons viewed them favorably. Similarly more than 95% of the

respondents in both years were confident that the lessons were “completely” or “mostly” grade appropriate, that “the instructional procedures would accomplish desired learning,” and that “the lessons were of suitable quality and appropriate to the students” (see Table 13 below, reprinted from B. D. Silver, “Pilot Teacher Survey 2003,” in full report). Ninety-four percent of the 2003 teachers and 87% of the 2002 respondents rated the “resources available for the project” as “very good” or “good.” “These are very high marks for the LTG Project,” concludes Professor Silver.

**Table 13**

**“When piloting the lessons, to what extent did you feel confident that . . .” (B22)**

Percent reporting “Completely” or “Mostly” rather than “Not very much” or “Not at all”

<b>Teacher Cohort</b>	<b>Matrix (2000)</b>	<b>Residential Institute (2000)</b>	<b>Pilot 2002</b>	<b>Pilot 2003</b>
Topics were grade appropriate	96	93	96	96
Instructional procedures would accomplish desired learning	100	93	99	99
Assessments would provide meaningful information	89	80	88	84
You had adequate training for the task	89	87	88	94
You had resources to acquire knowledge needed to teach the content	NA	NA	91	94
Lessons were of suitable quality and appropriate to the students	100	100	98	96
You had adequate computer skills	74	67	97	94
You knew how to use e-mail to communicate with others on project	93	80	89	89

Reprinted from: Silver, B. D. (2003, September). Pilot teacher survey 2003. In Learning to Give: Final Evaluation Report. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Office of the Assistant Provost for University Outreach & Engagement.

The pilot teachers, in addressing the open-ended question: “What aspects of these materials or plans are most in need of improvement?”, made many suggestions focusing primarily on making more materials immediately available rather than expecting teachers to locate recommended resources on their own, on expanding and updating the list of corollary materials, and on adjusting language to make it more age appropriate. Despite describing the lessons as “complete” or “mostly complete,” many of the teachers indicated that they wished the curriculum packages they received from LTG had contained more material. Several indicated the need for “more resources to share with students,” “more background material,” and “background information on topics that are aligned for a third-grade reading level (nonfiction reading materials).” The teachers also indicated a desire to have more of the recommended materials delivered with the curriculum package rather than having to collect them on their own from the Internet or their local libraries. Quite similar comments run through the responses

of those attending the summer workshops and are echoed strongly in the administrative interviews conducted in 2002, where respondents recommended that LTG provide:

- More detailed lesson plans and/or additional information on the website;
- Additional content relevant to the history curriculum;
- Suggestions of alternative texts to accompany the lessons; and
- More textbooks, supplemental handouts, or media to be used in the classroom.

In short there appears to be, especially among newer teachers, a persistent desire for more “stuff.”

Further analysis indicated that the fewer years of teacher experience, the more likely teachers were to feel that they wanted more materials, and wanted more of them provided in the curriculum package. This finding suggests that the Project should consider whether developing and distributing more prepared texts, teachers handbooks and supplements, workbooks, and other “physical” materials would significantly enhance its general adoption in schools in Michigan and beyond.

## Internet Use and Delivery

The Project maintains a website containing materials designed to support teachers as they use the LTG materials in their classrooms. The survey asked the teachers how helpful that site was to them. A somewhat surprising finding was that 30% in 2002 and 25% in 2003 reported that they had never logged on to the Project site; an additional 16% and 14% had done so only once. Eighty percent of those who did log on found the site either “very useful” or “somewhat useful” (with the latter response the most frequent). Teachers in the earlier cohorts somewhat paradoxically used the website more but found it less useful. A careful analysis of the 2002 data found that frequency of logging on to the website did not correlate with years of teaching experience or with use of the Web for other purposes (84% of the 2002 respondents reported that they used the Internet at least once a week; 73% reported using the Web several times a week). In fact those with fewer years of experience and thus, presumably, younger and more “computer literate,” used the website less than did more experienced teachers (suggesting that the newer teachers did not find the Web a ready place to locate the “stuff” that they wished to have). Use of the website is considerably lower among the pilot school teachers than among the earlier cohorts, perhaps because many of those in the earlier cohorts had few immediate colleagues involved in LTG and thus turned more frequently to the website.

## Student Learning

Although other parts of this evaluation focus on student learning, the survey of pilot teachers did ask them to evaluate “how much did the unit enhance or enrich the students’ understanding of philanthropy?” In 2003, 67% of the teachers chose “a great deal” and 60% did so in 2002; 30% and 38%, respectively, chose “some.” These again are very high marks. In 2002 the evaluators analyzed the responses to this question against the “grades” that the teachers in a survey conducted by LTG staff felt, without formal assessment, their students had attained. Probably because there was so little variance in the “grades” assigned, no correlation was identified and the analysis was not repeated.

## Service Learning

Only about two-thirds of the pilot teachers incorporated a service-learning component in their LTG classes (66% in 2003; 64% in 2002) even though all the teachers were expected to do so as part of the LTG program. Lack of time and experience with the curriculum is surely one explanation of these surprisingly low figures. Several teachers commented in the survey margins that they planned to introduce the component in the future but had not yet had time to do so. When the respondents were divided according to the number of years of experience with the Project, it was found that 75% of those who had at least eighteen months' experience with the curriculum included service learning, while only 52% with fewer than 18 months' experience did so. That one-quarter of those who were experienced in the program did not include service learning suggests that teachers' inclination also plays a role in determining whether a service-learning experience is available to students in particular classrooms. For instance, in answering, "How useful is it to include service learning in this program?" 94% of those who had included it indicated that doing so was either "essential" or "very useful" while only 59% of those who did not include such an experience chose those two most positive answers. Approximately three-fifths of the pilot teachers who incorporated service learning in their LTG lessons felt that the service-learning experience contributed "a lot" to student, and their own, interest in and understanding of philanthropy. In terms of student interest and understanding almost all the rest chose "some"; five percent or fewer thought "very little."

## Long-Term Impact Survey

Early in the fall of 2003 the MSU evaluation team will ask all teachers who have ever been associated with LTG (excluding the pilot teachers surveyed in the spring of 2003) to complete an online survey (see M. I. Wilson and B. D. Silver, "Long Term Impacts 2003," in full report). The survey seeks to determine if, and how long, teachers who are known to have once used LTG materials continue to use them; whether they remain in contact with the LTG Project; whether they continue to include philanthropy content in their teaching even though they may no longer use LTG materials. Survey recipients will also be asked, in open-ended questions, their opinions as to how the inclusion of philanthropy content affects students and classroom behavior and atmosphere over time. It will also query them about the impact that association with LTG may have had on them personally. Responses should be analyzed and the results presented in September 2003.

## Teacher Outcomes Summary

The surveys of teachers (three administered to summer workshop participants in summer 2001, 2002, and 2003; two, to pilot school teachers in spring 2002 and 2003) revealed that the high level of enthusiasm for the LTG Project mission and materials displayed in the first three years (Phase 1) continued, even though the Project's move to involve whole school buildings meant that participation was not always the individual choice it had been in prior years. The surveys showed that summer institute participants, most of whom did participate on their own initiative, are increasingly attracted to LTG through recommendations from colleagues and supervisors, indicating the increased visibility of the Project among Michigan educators. All the surveys showed high levels of satisfaction with the Project's materials and training (both the

summer workshops and the in-service training sessions). The pilot teachers responding to the spring surveys were very confident that they understood the goals of the Project, the meaning of philanthropy, and the actions that were expected of them in implementing the lessons. These findings are in sharp contrast to those of Phase I of the Project where teachers expressed considerable confusion about what was expected of them and lack of confidence in their preparation for doing so. The pilot school teachers also reported that they more frequently discussed LTG issues with their colleagues, both those using LTG materials themselves and with others, and that they were less dependent on supervisors or LTG staff for support in implementing their LTG lessons. The evaluators believe that these findings occurred, at least in part, because of the building-wide nature of the LTG Project in the pilot schools. In describing their opinions of the LTG materials the pilot teachers gave very high marks to the lessons' completeness, quality, and grade appropriateness. Almost every one of the teachers using the lessons viewed them favorably.

# Issues for Further Consideration

On the basis of the reports summarized above and of more than six years of observing aspects of the Project, the evaluators would like to recommend several issues for further consideration.

## Curriculum

The evaluation process clearly displayed the teachers' enthusiastic approval of the curriculum and its materials and it clearly showed that it was helping greatly to familiarize students with the basic concepts of philanthropy and civic engagement.

## Materials

Many of the teachers, especially those with fewer years of teaching experience, indicated that they would have appreciated having additional materials furnished with the LTG packets or made more easily available to them. It is not clear just how seriously to take these comments for it may be true that it, or something quite like it, is a uniform complaint about curricular materials that occurs when any new product is introduced. However, given the Project's commitment to expanding usage of the materials over several states, it may prove productive to conduct some further studies (in-depth interviews, for instance) of pilot teachers to get a clear fix on what additional materials they would find most useful, as a way of discovering whether they could be provided and how to get them publicized effectively, efficiently, and not too expensively.

The Internet would seem to be one inexpensive and effective way of providing materials to the teachers. The evaluators were surprised by the number of teachers who indicated that they had not visited the Project website at all or only once. Although that number has decreased somewhat between 2002 and 2003, still in the latter year a quarter of the teachers (many of whom had been working with Project materials for at least two years) did not log on to the website at all. Further study of the website and teachers' use (or non-use) of it is recommended. Studies of how teachers used the LTG site would help the Project continue the process of making the site more attractive and rich. That a higher number of teachers who used the site chose "somewhat useful" rather than "very useful" to characterize their assessment of it suggests that the site can be substantially improved (such temperate enthusiasm from the pilot teachers was very uncommon when they were asked to evaluate LTG products). Interviewing those who used the site only once or not at all would help determine what factors (lack of interest, no sense of need for further information, computer phobia, etc.) keeps them from doing so and what changes might motivate them to use the resource regularly.

It appears from the teachers' responses to the pilot teacher survey that teachers with less experience wished to have more materials provided, felt the initial training session was less adequate, and used the Project's website less. The Project needs to be especially sensitive, as it moves toward expansion to more locations, to exploring whether some modification of the way that less experienced teachers are introduced to the program is warranted.

## Service Learning

The evaluators continue to be concerned that more than 30% of the teachers are not requiring a service-learning component for their students during the LTG units. The lack of universal provision of such experiences accounts, surely, for the fact that somewhat more than ten percent of the students report not participating in any community service or volunteer work. Although getting service-learning experiences organized and incorporated is complex and time-consuming, the fact that the percentage who did not incorporate a service-learning component in 2003 was virtually the same as in 2002 (34% v. 36%) suggests that more time is unlikely to fix this issue. The teachers' responses suggest that there may be a deeper problem here in that while virtually all (94%) of those incorporating service learning in their classes thought the experience "essential" or "very useful," only 59% of those who did not attached those levels of importance to it. Again, further exploration (presumably through interviews) of the basis of those teachers' decisions not to implement this part of the curriculum is recommended. With this low level of response, the Project needs to determine how it can modify its materials or provide greater support so that service-learning experiences will be available to more of the students receiving the LTG curriculum.

## Learning About Philanthropy's Impact

The evaluators were struck by the substantial number of students who claimed not to have been aware of any systematic attempts to assess the effectiveness of the service project in which they were engaged. Evaluation is a very complex and challenging topic, especially for middle school students (which most of the respondents were) but it is also a highly important one that greatly affects support for and policy governing philanthropy, service, and civic engagement. LTG may wish, therefore, to give more attention to emphasizing the role of assessment and measurement in philanthropy, both in its materials and in the training it provides to teachers adopting the curriculum. It may be especially productive to link those content areas to the students' service-learning experiences as a way of giving the more abstract issue of assessment a concrete dimension—another reason to seek to make the service-learning component of the curriculum available to all the students in Project classrooms. We recognize that this is no easy task. Finding the proper balance between generating an enthusiastic appreciation of giving and the spirit that motivates it and instilling the recognition that not all giving is equally effective and helpful requires very careful work. But that balanced approach is necessary in teaching young people about philanthropy and civic engagement.

## Evaluation

The coming phase of the LTG Project will see substantial changes in the evaluation design, with much more attention given to assessment of LTG's effect on school climate, to observation of LTG classroom interactions, and to administration of project-developed pre- and post-tests to measure changes in student understanding of the Project's learning objectives. More emphasis, in other words, will fall on direct assessment of what goes on in the classrooms and the impact on student learning and, to the extent possible, on student behavior (as evidenced in school climate).

Two issues regarding evaluation of the Project merit further comment. First, the evaluators were disappointed at the response rates from both teachers and students in the 2003 round. Student survey responses declined from 517 to 222, the teacher response rate declined from 74% to 61%. Thus the samples on which analysis rests are disturbingly small, and over the past year have become smaller rather than larger. As the Project moves into Phase III it needs to find a way to make clearer to

participants that the contribution and collection of data are both an aspect of their responsibility and a necessary component to the Project's continued success. To persuade people to continue to support the LTG Project, the assessment of its impact must rest on more comprehensive data. We believe that the pre- and post-testing that will occur in the next phase of the Project, by its very nature, will increase the number of students included. But for evidence of behavior and motivation, evaluators of the Project must rely on teachers voluntarily completing surveys and submitting student work. Greater cooperation is necessary.

Second, the underrepresentation of older students in the program and thus in the student work and survey data continues. Additional efforts need to be made to increase the amount of student work and the number of surveys from students, especially in grades 9-12 but more generally in all the grades from 6 up. Similarly more opinions and evaluations need to be gathered from instructors who teach middle and high school students (in 2003, for example, 85% of the teachers' survey respondents taught in grades K through 5). In all probability this will necessitate the recruitment of more high schools to the Project (or asking states new to the Project in 2003-2004 to emphasize recruitment of higher grades in their samples) since it appears that high school teachers are less likely to encourage their students to contribute data. If the Project is going to make the case for its effectiveness, it is especially important, we feel, that it be able to present data on the progress of more mature students as they learn about the more complex issues surrounding philanthropy—especially assessment—and engage in more sustained and challenging service-learning projects.

# Closing Thoughts

The first thing that the evaluation team wishes to stress in this overview is the enormous strides that the Project has taken over the six years that MSU has been following it. Not all of these improvements are emphasized in this report because the evaluation design underwent fundamental changes that make direct quantitative comparisons between these last three years of the Project and the ones preceding impossible. However, the magnitude of the improvement is clearly visible when the teachers recently joining the Project express a much clearer understanding of the purpose of the Project and their role in it, and in their confidence that they have received the training and the tools to implement it successfully in their classrooms. The Project's decision to work with a limited number of school buildings to implement the curriculum across the grades rather than recruiting one or two teachers per building was a major advance. By engaging several teachers in a single building, the LTG program seems to have succeeded in giving teachers opportunities to discuss their LTG work with colleagues and to introduce more challenging topics on the assumption that at least some of their students will have already experienced the introductory material in earlier classes. The new arrangement also makes it more likely that LTG can influence school climate. It will also make it more possible, in the years to come, to use baseline information gathered in 2002 and 2003 to document some changes in student learning and possibly behavior.

This overview report of the results of the Phase II evaluation has focused primarily on data from the last two years and does not, consequently, indicate great changes in results between 2002 and 2003. Again, the small differences in responses between 2002 and 2003 should not obscure the extent of the progress that the Project has made since 1997. This is not to say that advances have not occurred in the past two years—teachers are teaching more complex concepts this year than last, pushing their students toward a deeper understanding of philanthropy and its place in community. And, if only slightly, teachers this year rated the lessons better and their confidence in their ability to teach them higher. The review of student work indicates that in the second year of the pilot school program, teachers are moving beyond the introductory lessons and concepts to present more challenging concepts to their students—suggesting a cumulative effect in schools where LTG is taught in at least once classroom at every grade level.

The ultimate goal, of course, is to encourage young people to understand the important roles of philanthropy and volunteerism in civil society and their responsibility to participate in furthering the common good through philanthropy and volunteerism. While it is impossible to predict how today's students will behave as adults, the findings of this evaluation suggest that the Project is giving students a solid foundation. Understanding of the basic concepts of philanthropy and the common good is high among the students and a significant number of them demonstrate the ability to connect those "academic" concepts to their out-of-school experience. And because of its emphasis on service and civic responsibility, the Project has stimulated almost all of the students participating in the program to engage in some form of voluntary service to their community—a rate of involvement almost twice that of most school children.



Philanthropy

Caring, sharing  
and personal action  
for the common good.

*Learning to Give has matured in its ability to transmit the mission and content of the curriculum, even as this curriculum continues to be developed and improved. For many teachers, LTG has helped to transform their roles as teachers. These results continue to speak well for the future national propagation and portability of the program.*

*-- Brian D. Silver  
MSU Evaluation Team*

To make  
the world  
a better  
place

MICHIGAN STATE  
UNIVERSITY

Advancing Knowledge.  
Transforming Lives.

*MSU is an affirmative-action,  
equal-opportunity institution.*

