

**LESSONS
LEARNED
FROM THE
EXPERIENCE
OF SUBTITLE
D PROGRAMS**

January 23,
1995

Authors:

J. W. Frees

Tyrone Hardaway

Gretchen Locke

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Recruiting a Diverse Corps of Participants	11
2.1 Achieving Diversity Goals	12
2.2 Limits on Diversity	17
2.3 Timing of Recruitment and Enrollment Periods	21
2.4 The Appeal of Service	22
Chapter Three: Providing Education and Training	25
3.1 Orientation and Initial Training	27
3.2 Developing a Comprehensive Education Curriculum	29
3.3 Service Learning	32
Chapter Four: Providing Service to Meet Community Needs	37
4.1 Building Service Partnerships	37
4.2 Developing Service Projects	44
4.3 Promoting Service Quality	46
Chapter Five: Program Organization and Staffing	49
5.1 Organizational Setting	50
5.2 Staffing	54
Chapter Six: Summary and Implications	59
Appendix: Summary of Program Models	

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This report presents interim findings from the evaluation of National Service Demonstration programs funded under Subtitle D of the National and Community Service Act of 1990. The purpose of Subtitle D was to develop and test demonstration programs that might "serve as an effective model for a large-scale national service program." The initial program grants were made in July 1992 and the first group of eight Subtitle D programs began operations between September 1992 and March 1993. Following a second round of grant awards in July 1993, four additional Subtitle D programs began operations between September 1993 and March 1994.

Exhibit 1.2
Key Program Characteristics

Site	Scope	Type of Organization	Organization of Service	Focus of Service	Size			
					Staff	Team Leaders	Slots	Target Group
City Volunteer Corps	City	Private nonprofit	Crew	Varied/direct service	3	6	85	Youth
City Year - Boston	City	Private nonprofit	Crew	Varied/direct service	71	27	300	Youth
Delta Service Corps	Multi-state	Consortium of state agencies and nonprofits	Individual	Varied/direct service	13	34	225	Inter-generational
Georgia Peach Corps	Rural counties	State Department of Community Services	Crew	Varied/direct service	9	6	120	Inter-generational
Kansas Health and Safety Corps	State	State Department of Education	Individual	Health and safety/direct service	2	0	24	Inter-generational
New Jersey Urban School Service Corps	State	State Department of Higher Education	Crew	Education/direct service	5	12	220	Inter-generational
Pennsylvania Service Corps	State	Private nonprofit	Individual	Varied/direct service and volunteer mobilization	4	3	110	Inter-generational
Public Allies	City	Private nonprofit	Individual	Varied/direct service	3	3	30	Youth
Volunteer Maryland	State	Governor's Office of Volunteerism	Individual	Varied/volunteer mobilization	5	5	105	Inter-generational

Exhibit 1.1 presents a summary profile of each program. Exhibit 1.2 displays the basic characteristics of the nine Subtitle D programs that are included in the present evaluation.¹ These programs present a broad and diverse range of program designs, all of which were still evolving throughout the data collection period for this evaluation. Excepting only City Year, none of the programs were established prior to CNCS grant receipt in 1992.² City Year enrolled its first full-time participants in the 1990-91 program year, following a summer pilot program in 1989. City Year is thus much further along the developmental curve than any of the other demonstration programs, and offers a richer store of experience and lessons for this report. (Until receiving its Commission grant for the 1992-93 program year, City Year had been entirely dependent on contributions from the private sector.)

The programs vary greatly in size. The two largest programs—City Year and the Delta Service Corps—together account for 55 percent of all the participants and 53 percent of all the service projects in the Subtitle D programs. Exhibit 1.3 shows the relative size of each program.

Other salient dimensions of variation are:

- **Scope.** Three programs provide their services entirely within a single metropolitan area; one program provides services only in two rural counties; four programs are statewide; and one regional program provides services across three states.
- **Type of organization.** Four programs are operated by private nonprofit organizations, four by state agencies, and one by a consortium of nonprofit organizations and state agencies.
- **Organization of service.** Four programs deploy participants in crews of 10 to 12 members who provide service as a group; five programs place participants individually in community organizations and public agencies.

¹. A total of fifteen programs received funding under Subtitle D. Eight programs were funded in the 1992-93 program year; six of these received continuation funding for the 1993-94 program year. Only these six are included in the report. In addition, seven new programs received funding in the 1993-94 program year, three receiving operational grants and four planning grants. Only the three programs with operational grants are included in this report.

². City Volunteer Corps (CVC) has a longer operational history as a community service program. The first participants in its youth corps program were enrolled in 1984 and it has operated continuously since then. However, CVC's Subtitle D program is a significantly enhanced version of its established youth corps program. Therefore, for purposes of this review we treat CVC as a new program.

- **Focus of service.** Most of the programs provide direct services to meet a variety of community needs, including education, human services, and public safety; one program focuses on education; and one program focuses on health and safety. Another program, Volunteer Maryland, provides services more indirectly by using participants to develop the capacity of other agencies and organizations to more effectively recruit and mobilize volunteers.
- **Target group.** Three are youth programs, with participation limited to individuals under 30; the other six are intergenerational, including participants as young as 17 and as old as 82.

When grants were first awarded, it was expected that the demonstration period would be three years, with final evaluation reports produced in September 1995. The purpose of the evaluation was to describe the characteristics of programs and their participants, measure the amount and types of services provided, determine whether the programs made a difference in the lives of participants and in the communities served, and assess their cost-effectiveness. The results of the evaluation were to be used in drafting legislation to design a new program of national service that might begin operations in 1996.

However, following the election of President Clinton in November 1992, events moved more quickly than had been expected. National service was one of the major domestic policy priorities of the new administration, and national service legislation was introduced in the Senate in April 1993. The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, signed into law on September 21, 1993, created a new comprehensive system of national service, known as AmeriCorps, to be administered by the Corporation for National Service through grants to states, not-for-profit organizations, colleges and universities, local governments, school districts, Indian tribes, and federal agencies.

Rather than the "large-scale national service program" envisioned in the 1990 Act, the new system actually established in the 1993 Act is one of myriad national, state, and local programs of community service. The Corporation provides policy direction, administrative oversight, basic funding, and technical assistance to the agencies and organizations that actually operate the programs. In the period from June through September 1994, the Corporation awarded grants to 50 state commissions for national service and 57 national organizations and federal agencies to operate AmeriCorps programs in urban and rural communities throughout the nation. The former Subtitle

D programs have been incorporated into AmeriCorps. In this system of program diversity and local autonomy, the experiences of the Subtitle D programs have particular relevance precisely because the Subtitle D programs themselves are highly diverse and tailored to local circumstances, resources, and objectives, albeit within basic functional requirements specified in the 1990 Act.

The 1990 Act specified essential features that each Subtitle D program must incorporate in its design. Within these constraints, local programs were encouraged to develop, implement, and refine their own distinctive approaches. Design requirements cover three central program functions:

1. ***Recruitment and selection of participants.*** Programs were directed to recruit and select "an ethnically and economically diverse group of participants."
2. ***Provision of education and training services for participants.*** Programs were directed to provide a series of specific training and education services:
 - Orientation to the "nature, philosophy, and purpose of community service,"
 - General training in "citizenship, civic responsibility, and community service,"
 - Training in the "skills relevant to the work to be conducted," including specialized training for the type of service that each participant will perform,
 - Service learning opportunities "to reflect on their service experience," and
 - "In-service educational services and materials to enable participants to obtain a high school diploma or the equivalent of such diploma."
3. ***Provision of services to meet community needs.*** In developing service projects, programs were directed to:
 - Place participants in areas within the state to provide the "optimum match between community needs and anticipated supply of participants,"
 - Recruit and select "sponsoring organizations that will receive participants,"
 - Match "participants with sponsoring organizations," and
 - Place "participants in teams or individual placements."

Exhibit 1.4 depicts a functional model of the Subtitle D program process. Programs reach out into local communities to recruit and select a stream of participants and a stream of sponsoring organizations. Participants are placed either individually or in teams with a sponsoring organization to carry out service projects. In addition to providing an initial orientation for participants and sponsoring organizations, the programs provide continuing education and training to participants along with ongoing monitoring and quality control of service projects. The model describes the common features shared by all Subtitle D programs and provides the organizing framework for this report, which summarizes the practical lessons to be learned about program implementation and operations on the basis of the initial experiences of the Subtitle D programs in each of these three functional areas. Chapters Two through Four discuss each of these program functions--recruitment, education and training, and provision of service--in turn. In Chapter Five, we look across functions to examine program organization and management. Chapter Six discusses the broader implications of these findings.

This interim report can draw upon only a portion of the full data base that will ultimately be available to the evaluation. Specifically, this report is based on interviews and observations from a series of field visits to each of the Subtitle D programs conducted over the past eighteen months, and on information regarding the characteristics of individual participants and service projects provided by each program on standard reporting forms. The final evaluation report will also have data on participants who completed their enrollments and those who dropped out, on the accomplishments of service projects, and on sponsoring organizations' assessments of service value and quality. The final report will thus provide a more comprehensive evaluation of Subtitle D programs.³

³. The final report will include a quantitative assessment of community impacts and a qualitative assessment of participant impacts.

Exhibit 1.1
Subtitle D Programs

Program	Description
City Volunteer Corps	This program is housed within a large urban youth corps program based in New York City. The demonstration program is called the City Volunteer Corps Leadership Program, an enhanced version of the organization's basic youth corps program. This enhanced corps is intended to stress leadership development and provide participants with the skills and experience to act as change agents in their communities. Eligibility is limited to individuals between the ages of 18 and 30. Participants undertake a variety of short-term and long-term service projects within a limited community in the city.
City Year	This Boston program is a youth service corps, with eligibility restricted to individuals between 17 and 23 years of age. All participants are full-time; the basic term of service is nine months. The program is organized around 12-member teams, each supervised by a team leader who is a paid staff member. Teams typically undertake two to three short-term service projects, lasting from one day to three weeks, and one year-long service project that represents a sustained commitment to a single agency or organization.
Delta Service Corps	This is a regional program placing individual participants in public agencies and community organizations throughout the lower Mississippi River Delta in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. The program includes both full-time and part-time participants, and service projects cover a broad range of activities. Delta Service Corps is an intergenerational program, with participants ranging in age from 17 to 82; 20 percent are over the age of 60. To facilitate management and service learning, participants are organized into dispersed teams supervised by team leaders who are themselves full-time participants rather than paid staff.
Georgia Peach Corps	This is a year-long, crew-based, intergenerational program. Twenty-five percent of its participants are under 20 years of age and 15 percent are over 60. The program's most distinctive feature is community development tied into community service. The program operates in two rural counties. In each county, three crews of 20 participants each rotate through four-month projects in three service areas—human services, education, and public works.
Kansas Health and Safety Corps	This is a statewide program that places teams of two full-time participants in Kansas State University Extension Offices. The program is intended to alleviate critical shortages of trained emergency response care in rural communities. Participants work closely with a county extension agent and a local planning committee assembled by the participants themselves to assess the emergency care needs of county residents and plan specific service projects.
New Jersey Urban School Service Corps	The program builds on the Comer school reform initiative underway in New Jersey by placing teams of full-time and part-time participants in 12 schools throughout the state that have already adopted the Comer model. Full-time participants are recruited from the local communities served by the schools and serve for a school year. Most

Program	Description
	service projects involve extended-day programs for students, including individual tutoring, reading and math clubs, and recreational programs. Other projects focus on facilitating access of school children and their families to needed social services and community resources.
Pennsylvania Service Corps	This is a statewide program placing individual participants in community organizations, schools, and colleges. All participants serve on a full-time basis for 12 months. While participants undertake a variety of service projects, those placed at colleges focus on design and coordination of programs that recruit student volunteers and match them with public agencies and community organizations.
Public Allies	The program is an urban youth corps; eligibility is restricted to individuals between the ages of 18 and 30. All participants are full-time and serve for one year. They are placed individually in public agencies and community organizations throughout Chicago. Service projects focus on housing, health care, and youth development. Participants are organized into dispersed teams of 10 members, each supervised by a team leader. Each team concentrates on a single issue area.
Volunteer Maryland	Volunteer Maryland is a statewide program that places individual participants as volunteer coordinators at public agencies and community organizations. The program includes both full-time and part-time participants who receive an intensive three-week course in volunteer management at the start of each service year. Their primary responsibility is to develop the capacity of the host organization to effectively mobilize volunteers. Their tasks include recruiting volunteers, training staff to work with volunteers, and developing volunteer tracking systems.

CHAPTER TWO

RECRUITING A DIVERSE CORPS OF PARTICIPANTS

An explicit goal of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 was to attract a broad and representative range of American citizens to service. The Act specifically directs programs to recruit "an ethnically and economically diverse group of participants." The legislative history¹ expresses the intent of the Congress that programs should "involve Americans of all backgrounds" and that a "national service program should be inclusive in nature. It must be neither an elite preserve for the affluent and well-educated, nor a sub-minimum wage holding pattern for the poor and disadvantaged." Programs are encouraged to "reach out to potential participants of all ages, economic levels, ethnic backgrounds, and gender...."

The Subtitle D programs have sought to achieve diversity in gender, education, race/ethnicity, age, technical skills, physical ability, and work experience. Within the limits of the population from which they draw applicants, *the Subtitle D programs have demonstrated that they can successfully recruit and deploy participants who are highly diverse along a broad range of characteristics; that is, they have shown that national service can attract a representative sample of all Americans.*

1. Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee Report No.101-176, October 27, 1989, U.S. Code Congressional and Administrative News, 101st Congress, Second Session, 1990, p. 4475.

The recruitment and selection process in the national demonstration programs is also designed to screen participants for motivation and ability. Outreach through peer recruitment and service partners promotes a flow of applications from individuals with demonstrated interest in community service and willingness to serve. The application process typically entails completion of a written application form, preliminary review by a selection committee, and personal interviews. Several programs ask applicants to write a brief essay explaining why they want to participate, what they hope to contribute to the community, and what they hope to gain from the experience. Some also ask for letters of recommendation. Personal interviews with program staff allow applicants with limited writing skills to express themselves directly. Most programs also incorporate team leaders or current participants into the selection committee to ensure that applicants are evaluated by a committee representing different points of view and experience.

2.1 ACHIEVING DIVERSITY GOALS

To successfully recruit and enroll a diverse corps of participants, programs found it useful to define target groups in terms of priority, set numerical goals for each target group, monitor the results of recruitment and selection efforts against these goals, and modify recruitment efforts as necessary.

The efforts of programs to achieve gender diversity demonstrates the value of monitoring performance against defined numerical targets. While all programs sought a roughly equal distribution of male and female participants, only City Year, CVC and Public Allies were able to achieve that goal. They did so by setting explicit enrollment goals and systematically monitoring progress in achieving these goals. In the other programs, the overall ratio of female to male participants is about two to one. It is almost three to one in the Delta Service Corps.

During the recruitment and selection process, City Year, CVC, and the Pennsylvania Service Corps monitored the results numerically. Neither program set quotas~~x~~that is, neither made specific selection decisions simply to achieve an equal balance of participants by gender. Rather, they used the numerical targets as a check on their own selection decisions, as a way of testing and challenging their own recruitment procedures. For example, if they were enrolling a disproportionate number of female participants, they could look more closely at whether the factors they were considering in making selection decisions inadvertently favored female participants,

whether they were attracting a sufficient number of male applicants, how they might modify recruitment to reach more qualified male applicants, and whether the program offered the right mix of service and learning opportunities to attract more male applicants. What starts out as a narrow and focused task (monitoring achievement of diversity goals) can thus lead naturally to more comprehensive monitoring and quality improvement of the entire program.

The value of setting numerical targets and monitoring performance can also be seen in the efforts of programs to achieve racial and ethnic diversity. The overall distribution² of participants by race/ethnicity is shown in Exhibit 2.1. Most participants (89 percent) are either African-American or white, although the variation among programs is quite striking. The three urban programs have the most ethnically diverse participants: in City Year, 45 percent of participants are white, 33 percent African-American, 11 percent Hispanic, and 8 percent Asian; in Public Allies, 36 percent of participants are white, 50 percent African-American, and 11 percent Hispanic; and in CVC, 42 percent of participants are African-American, 38 percent Hispanic, and 17 percent white. All three programs set targets, monitored their performance, and adjusted their recruitment efforts as necessary to achieve the kind of diversity they were seeking. In Public Allies, for example, the program maintained an active recruitment effort throughout the selection period. If staff found, for instance, that they were seeing too few Asian-American applicants, increased efforts were made to attract more applicants from this group, primarily by calling community organizations and associations to identify likely applicants.

2. The participant characteristics shown in the exhibits in this chapter and in Appendix exhibits A.2 and A.3 are based on EIS forms received through July 30, 1994. EIS enrollment forms are due the 20th of the month following the participant's enrollment. Therefore, these data reflect participants enrolled over the period July 1, 1993, when EIS reporting began, through June 30, 1994. The EIS enrollment forms thus potentially capture both first year and second year participants. The extent to which these figures represent Year 1, Year 2, or some combination varies by program. Specifically:

- ⊘ Georgia includes only Year 1 participants; the second cohort did not enroll until July 1994.
- ⊘ Pennsylvania, Delta, and Maryland includes both Year 1 and Year 2 participants.
- ⊘ City Year includes Year 2 participants only; the Year 1 cohort had all terminated by July 1, 1993.
- ⊘ NJ, Public Allies, Kansas, and CVC includes Year 2 participants only (recognizing that Year 2 is the first year of Subtitle D operations for these four programs).

Exhibit 2.1

Exhibit 2.2

The Subtitle D programs have shown that they can recruit and enroll seniors as well as youth. The programs have been able to enroll participants across three or four generations. Participants range in age from 17 to 82. Exhibit 2.2 displays the distribution of participants by age. A majority of the participants are between 21 and 40, but the overall distribution is powerfully affected by the two largest programs. City Year is a youth service corps and all its participants are between 16 and 25. City Year program accounts for about two-thirds (66 percent) of the participants under 20 years of age across all the programs. The Delta Service Corps is a intergenerational program that systematically recruits older participants; it accounts for most (69 percent) of the participants over 50 years of age. The Georgia Peach Corps also set enrollment targets for senior participants, adding enough participants over 60 to make up 15 percent of its enrollment. Judging from the experience of the Delta Service Corps, seniors are much more responsive to the opportunity to participate in service part-time rather than full-time. Ninety percent of participants over 60 years of age are enrolled on a part-time basis.

Programs have found that an effective method of targeted recruitment is to ask public agencies and community organizations to refer applicants to the program. National service programs should be encouraged to ask potential service partners to refer likely participants.

A good example of the potential advantages this recruitment method is the experience of the Delta Service Corps. Each of the three state programs has practiced "dual recruiting" of service partners and participants. During the application and review process, host organizations are encouraged to recommend applicants from among their own present and former volunteers and are given general assurance that (if accepted into the program) these applicants will be given first consideration for placement at these host organizations. This ensures the host site of satisfactory placement. Dual recruiting of this sort has expanded the reach and appeal of the program, particularly in the very poor, rural counties of the Delta where recruitment of participants had been quite difficult initially. Program staff make the reasonable argument that this method of recruitment does not displace existing volunteers; rather it mobilizes selected part-time volunteers into full-time participation in community service.

One disadvantage of this approach is that participants recruited in this manner are

sometimes torn between loyalty to the host organization and loyalty to the Delta Service Corps. The program has depended upon tri-state training, the use of common uniforms in all three states, and a high level of interaction with team leaders and other participants to build and sustain participants' sense of identity as members of the Delta Service Corps rather than as volunteers with their various organizations.

Programs have found that peer recruitment is an effective method of recruiting participants from selected target groups. Programs should be encouraged to organize recruitment events that make use of participants and to provide them with the necessary training and logistical support.

Peer recruitment is one of the most effective methods of targeted recruitment. City Year makes perhaps the most extensive use of this approach, arranging for teams to make presentations at schools, colleges, and community organizations during the prime recruiting months of February through May. The Delta Service Corps has used its senior participants in much the same way, if on a more individual and less systematic basis, to recruit other senior participants. Although other programs make less extensive use of peer recruiting, they all depend on participants to talk about the program with their friends, neighbors, and relatives. Other forms of outreach, such as notices, advertisements or direct mail, may bring the program to the attention of potential applicants, but their decision to apply is likely to be strongly affected by word of mouth.

2.2 LIMITS ON DIVERSITY

Not every program can achieve diversity on a broad range of characteristics. Different program designs limit diversity on certain characteristics, such as race/ethnicity, age, or education. The Corporation should take these limitations into account when awarding program grants, and decide explicitly whether to accept or reject designs that may limit participant diversity.

Race/Ethnicity. Some programs may be committed to local recruitment from target communities, which limits the range of racial/ethnic diversity they can achieve. In the New Jersey Urban School Service Corps, for example, 73 percent of participants are African-American. This concentration reflects the program's commitment to local recruitment and local control of final participant selection. Individual schools recruited in the local community and made final selection decisions. There was such a high level of response to this outreach that state program staff believe they could have filled the program entirely with African-American women in their twenties and thirties who had children in the schools.

In the Delta Service Corps, a policy of local recruitment was instituted from the beginning of the program. Each state managed its own recruitment and selection process, and all three states tailored their recruitment efforts to local circumstances, initially building on established linkages with existing organizations but subsequently developing its own network of local connections. While the Louisiana and Arkansas programs maintained a commitment to achieving racial/ethnic diversity, the Mississippi program committed itself to developing service projects in the poorest and most needy communities in the Delta region of the state and recruiting participants from the same communities. The population of these communities is predominantly African-American, and 93 percent of participants in the Mississippi Delta Service Corps are African-American. By contrast, the other two Delta programs show a more even balance of white and African-American participants. In the Louisiana Delta Service Corps, 44 percent of participants are white and 55 percent African-American. In the Arkansas Delta Service Corps, 57 percent of participants are white and 42 percent African-American.

Age. Youth corps programs also have obvious limits on their participant diversity in terms of age. Among the Subtitle D programs, City Year limits participation to individuals between 16 and 25 years of age. CVC and Public Allies limit participation to individuals under 30.

The Georgia Peach Corps is essentially a youth corps supplemented by a group of senior citizens; 85 percent of participants are 30 years of age or younger, and 15 percent are over 60. No participants are between 30 and 60 years of age.

Education. Three of these programs also include proportionally far more high school dropouts than are found in any other program. Both City Year and CVC include school dropouts among their recruitment targets. In each program, 19 percent of participants are high school dropouts. In the Georgia Peach Corps, 22 percent of participants are high school dropouts, although this is attributable less to efforts to achieve educational diversity than to difficulties in recruiting college students and college graduates.

Exhibit 2.3

Given the multi-stage selection process and written application requirements of all the programs, participants tend to be well educated. As Exhibit 2.3 shows, almost 90 percent of all participants in Subtitle D programs have at least a high school diploma or GED; about 25 percent have college degrees. In addition, some program designs require a high level of education, skills, or experience. In both Volunteer Maryland and the Pennsylvania Service Corps, the focus of service is building the capacity of public agencies and private organizations to recruit and deploy volunteers more effectively. Both programs particularly emphasize educational attainment as a selection factor. In the Pennsylvania Service Corps, all participants have GEDs or high school diplomas and 60 percent have college degrees. Similarly, 62 percent of participants in Volunteer Maryland have college degrees.

Work Experience. In addition to their educational attainment, participants tend to have experience in the world. Fifty percent of all participants have had previous work experience. Similarly, 52 percent of participants have previously done volunteer service in public agencies or community organizations. Only 25 percent of participants have neither work nor volunteer experience.

Exhibit 2.4

Household Income. Despite their education and work experience, participants tend to be from households of low or modest income. Exhibit 2.4 shows the distribution of participants by family income. In the 1990 census, median household income was \$31,203, and 59.6 percent of households reported annual income of \$25,000 or higher. Among participants in Subtitle D programs, only 22 percent report household income above \$25,000.

New programs need to be particularly careful in efforts to achieve their diversity goals because programs tend to replicate the level of diversity they achieve in their first enrollment cycles. It is particularly important to set and monitor diversity targets from the beginning.

Several programs have pointed out that peer recruitment can make a decisive difference in their ability to achieve diversity because applicants assess the suitability of a program by looking around to see if there are individuals like themselves in the program. A program whose participants are predominantly young, for example, will have less appeal to seniors than one that has some senior participants. Because of this dynamic, programs that fail to achieve their diversity goals early find that it becomes increasingly difficult to break this pattern.

The experience of the Georgia Peach Corps is instructive in this regard. Because of its problems in recruiting applicants who had other options for work or school, staff believe that the program came to be seen as targeted on low-income individuals, and this public perception made recruitment of more diverse applicants even more difficult. The program has taken considerable pains to correct this problem in subsequent enrollment cycles.

2.3 TIMING OF RECRUITMENT AND ENROLLMENT PERIODS

Programs that enroll annually should consider having at least two annual enrollment periods. This provides an opportunity to replace participants who leave the program before completing their terms and to adjust recruitment strategy to achieve enrollment goals.

The Subtitle D programs enroll participants either in a single annual cohort or in multiple cohorts throughout the year. Enrollment of participants in a single annual cohort has considerable appeal to programs, and most of the Subtitle D programs express a preference for this approach which follows the familiar rhythms of the school year and the agricultural cycle. City Year

explicitly models its program year on the academic calendar and follows a September-June schedule. Because all of its service activity takes place in schools, the New Jersey Urban School Service Corps also follows a September-June calendar. Among the Subtitle D programs, only the Delta Service Corps and the Pennsylvania Service Corps provided for multiple enrollment periods in their original plans, although CVC and Kansas subsequently found it useful to spread enrollment over two cohorts.

Use of multiple enrollment periods places more of a burden on program staff, primarily because it is necessary to conduct outreach, interview and select participants, and organize orientation and initial training several times a year, but it has other benefits that more than compensate for this burden. It is because of these benefits that we recommend that programs schedule at least two enrollment periods.

Those programs that enroll in multiple cohorts cite several advantages to this system, particularly during the first two years of programs operations. First, the problems encountered and lessons learned during the recruitment and program experience of each cohort can result in modifications and adaptations for following cohorts. The program can see quick results (good or bad) and can, again, act accordingly. A program does not have to wait a full year to implement changes. Second, the program has time to adjust its recruitment strategy to make up for problems in achieving its overall diversity goals in any single cohort. Third, a multiple enrollment system is an efficient way to use staff resources. In the Pennsylvania Service Corps, for example, the continuing education classes can be more "custom tailored" to the needs and interests of each cohort. Fourth, a multiple enrollment system provides the beneficiaries with year-round services. In the Pennsylvania Service Corps, for example, participants provide services in K-12 schools, colleges and universities, and at community-based organizations. The use of multiple enrollment cohorts allows the program to provide a continuous stream of services.

2.4 THE APPEAL OF SERVICE

In developing recruitment materials, programs should consider appealing primarily to the ethic of service rather than to more tangible benefits such as in-service stipends or post-service benefits.

Exhibit 2.5

During the enrollment process, participants are asked to state the primary reason why they joined the program. As shown in Exhibit 2.5, almost two-thirds of participants responded that they enrolled in the Subtitle D program primarily because of the opportunity to help other people through community service. This generally holds true across groups defined by program, location, age, gender, race/ethnicity, and family income. The next most common reasons given for joining the program are to get financial aid for education (the post-service scholarship) or to get a job, job training, or a chance to learn job skills. This suggests that, while programs benefit from appealing to tangible benefits such as scholarships or an opportunity to learn job skills, the most powerful appeal they can make to potential applicants is to stress the opportunity to help others through community service.

CHAPTER THREE

PROVIDING EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Subtitle D programs have set wide-ranging and ambitious goals for participant development and they commit substantial resources to education and training. Participants typically spend 25 percent of their time in different kinds of education and training activities, although the level of activity varies substantially across programs. The education and training components of each of the programs are summarized in Exhibit 3.1. Following the mandate of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, these activities are intended to:

- ⊘ Bring participants and staff together in a common vision of national service goals and objectives,
- ⊘ Teach and encourage an ethic of civic responsibility and community service,
- ⊘ Provide the practical knowledge and skills necessary to complete specific kinds of service projects,
- ⊘ Provide structured opportunities for participants to share and learn from their experiences through discussion and critical reflection, and
- ⊘ Offer an opportunity for school dropouts to complete their high school diplomas or general educational development (GED) degrees.

Exhibit 3.1
Training Components

Program	Initial Orientation and Training		Ongoing Training ^a	End of Service Training
	Residential	Duration		
City Volunteer Corps	Yes	1 week	Weekly education days	No
City Year	Yes	1 week	Weekly education days, ^b internships, mid-year retreat	3 days
Delta Service Corps	Yes	1 week	Periodic team meetings, mid-year conference	3 days
Georgia Peach Corps	Yes ^c	1 week	Weekly education days ^d	2 days
Kansas Health and Safety Corps	Yes	1 week	None	Under review
New Jersey Urban Schools Service Corps	Yes	1 week	Monthly in-service training	3 days
Pennsylvania Service Corps	Yes	1 week	"University in Dispersion" (10 times per year)	1 week
Public Allies	No	1 week	Weekly education days	2 days
Volunteer Maryland	Yes	3 weeks	In-service training approx. every three weeks	3 days

^a Training sessions are held at the program level unless otherwise indicated.

^b Most of City Year's weekly education sessions are at the division level, with a smaller proportion of corps-wide

^c In the first program year, the Peach Corps held a 3-day, nonresidential initial orientation and training. In the second year, the Peach Corps held a one-week, residential program and two additional weeks of nonresidential training.

^d One site has a corps-wide education day all day on Fridays. The other site has a half-day educational session during the week, and a half-day community meeting on Fridays.

Although the programs provide varying amounts of education and training, most provide orientation and initial training at the beginning of each enrollment cycle, periodic training sessions through the program year, and an end-of-service session.

The programs commit substantial resources to education and training activities. Their efforts focus on teaching civic responsibility, acceptance of diversity, and practical skills in planning and implementing community service projects.

Initial orientation and training is usually residential and lasts for three to five days. Ongoing training is more varied. The Georgia Peach Corps, Public Allies, City Year, and CVC set aside full days for education and training activities every week. City Year also arranges three-week "internships" in the middle of the year for participants to work in a variety of public agencies and community organizations, and two additional three-day sessions of residential training. The other programs offer smaller amounts of continuing education and training, ranging from four hours a week in the Delta Service Corps to none in the Kansas Health and Safety Corps. Some programs hold a mid-year training event or retreat. A few programs have participants complete special team projects called "signature projects," intended to provide a service learning opportunity, in which participants collaboratively plan, develop, and implement a highly visible community service project.

3.1 ORIENTATION AND INITIAL TRAINING

Residential orientation and training is an effective method for programs to use to begin teaching the values of community service and civic responsibility, convey their own specific missions and policies, and build a sense of teamwork and shared purpose.

Initial orientation and core training sessions serve several purposes. Program participants are introduced to the goals and philosophy of the program and given an overview of its policies and procedures. Initial core training often includes team-building activities intended to promote enthusiasm and create loyalty to the program. All the programs use some form of trust-building exercises. City Year has a series of exercises designed to demonstrate the value of teamwork. Volunteer Maryland incorporates Outward Bound-type activities to encourage a sense of teamwork among program participants.

The special value of residential training lies in the opportunities it provides for participants to get to know each other, to begin to appreciate the true meaning of diversity, and to develop relationships they can draw on throughout their service. This is particularly true for programs that place participants individually rather than in crews. For example, despite considerable logistical and financial burdens, the Delta Service Corps brings participants from all three states together for initial residential training at the beginning of each enrollment cycle and again each summer. It is at these sessions that participants acquire a regional identity and attachment to the Delta Service Corps rather than to their state programs. They also establish relationships across state lines based on similarities in service interests, skills, backgrounds, and personality. These relationships cut across demographic as well as geographic boundaries; they exemplify the value of diversity. The relationships established at initial training are maintained through telephone calls as participants in similar kinds of service projects reach out to one another for ideas, advice on resolving problems, and encouragement to persevere through difficulties. Most participants and staff state quite strongly that the interaction at tri-state training, and the relationships formed there, have been critical to their ability to be effective in their service projects.

The Georgia Peach Corps initially offered nonresidential orientation, but staff decided that participants would further benefit from a residential setting where they would have ample time to get to know one another and develop a sense of common purpose and shared commitment. In the next enrollment cycle, initial orientation and training consisted of a one-week residential session, followed by two weeks of additional, nonresidential training.

Volunteer Maryland has always devoted a full three weeks to orientation and initial training in a residential setting. Program staff find that this initial period of intensive training is crucial. It molds the participants into a close knit group, provides them with essential knowledge and skills in volunteer recruitment and management, and gives them a larger policy context to understand the program's mission.

More typically, participants spend about one week in orientation and initial training. The Georgia Peach Corps offered only a three-day session for its first enrollment cycle, but staff subsequently concluded that this was too little time for instruction and discussion. As noted above, they expanded the session to three weeks.

A period of three to four months is usually needed to plan and organize initial training sessions.

Education and training coordinators consistently comment on the burdens posed by residential training sessions. They emphasize the importance of allowing at least three to four months to make the necessary logistical arrangements. These include accommodations for participants and program staff, as well as travel arrangements, lecture rooms, small group meeting rooms, workbooks, and other materials. As the two largest programs, City Year and the Delta Service Corps face the most daunting obstacles. City Year chooses to conduct its residential training at a rural facility in the western part of the state. It arranges a small fleet of buses to transport participants. The Delta Service Corps, as part of its objective of promoting tri-state unity, rotates training sites among the three states.

Programs that conducted enrollment in a series of intake cycles throughout the year, such as the Pennsylvania Service Corps and the Delta Service Corps, have found the logistical burden of centralized, residential training to be so high that they have revised their schedules to permit no more than two enrollment cycles per year. In its first program year, the Delta Service Corps conducted initial residential orientation and training for five separate enrollment cycles (including a separate training session for part-time participants). Program staff, particularly the education and training coordinators, found that their ability to develop and implement continuing education programs was entirely compromised by the need to deal with the logistical demands of this series of initial training sessions.

To ease the burden on participants, programs should provide assistance to help participants with particular needs.

Residential training also poses some difficulties for participants. For example, with its commitment to local recruitment and involving parents with children in the schools, the New Jersey Urban School Service Corps includes a number of single mothers among its participants. Many of them found it both difficult and costly to arrange the necessary overnight child care to allow them to attend initial orientation and training, although all were ultimately able to do so.

3.2 DEVELOPING A COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION CURRICULUM

For some types of service projects, participants need specific knowledge and skills in order to be effective. Programs need to recognize this and provide the necessary training either directly or in conjunction with sponsoring organizations.

For example, participants working with young children in a Head Start program need to know about early childhood development in order to communicate appropriately with the children, choose age-appropriate activities, and ensure the children's safety. Participants who are renovating a homeless shelter may need construction skills, work site safety instruction, and practical math skills.

Program staff rely on varying combinations of internal program staff and service partners to provide site-specific training for program participants. In the Public Allies and Georgia Peach Corps programs, team leaders are largely responsible for training corpsmembers and supervising their work. A designated person at the partner organization provides project definition, general oversight, and a point of contact. In contrast, the Pennsylvania Service Corps and the Delta Service Corps, two large programs with participants individually placed in diverse agencies over a large geographic area, rely extensively on partner agency staff to provide substantive training for participants, including site-specific training and additional participant development opportunities. For example, participants in both programs described attending professional conferences, serving on community committees, and participating in staff development programs at their service sites.

In a few instances, programs have looked beyond their own staff and their service partners to find training resources. For example, when City Year decided to increase its emphasis on working with children during the 1993-94 program year, the program brought in outside consultants. The consultants designed instructional material and conducted workshops on age-appropriate behavior, discipline, and instructional techniques. The consultants were also asked to monitor teams on-site, identify additional instructional needs, and provide the necessary workshops.

Developing diverse learning opportunities appropriate for participants of widely varying ages, educational levels and life experiences has proven difficult. The Corporation can play an important technical assistance role by compiling and distributing information on best practices.

Participants frequently expressed frustration that training sessions were geared toward those with the lowest skill level; however, training coordinators expressed concern that dividing groups by ability levels undermined their programs' commitments to diversity. Programs used various strategies to address this issue. The Delta Service Corps, Pennsylvania Service Corps, and Volunteer Maryland used the selection process to identify applicants who already possessed at least some of the necessary skills. While this strategy seems to help lessen the training burden and enhance service quality, it tends to limit the pool of eligible applicants to those with marketable skills and potentially excludes some applicants who might benefit from the community service experience.

Two programs tried using participants with higher skill levels to train those with lower skills. The Peach Corps found this strategy did not work well for their participants. However, Volunteer Maryland staff, perhaps because their participants had higher skill levels, felt they made effective use of participants as trainers, especially later in the program year as participants became comfortable with their ability to serve as resources for each other.

Programs also experimented with different training formats. The New Jersey Urban Schools Service Corps found that training works best when various workshops are offered at monthly in-service training sessions, and participants decide which sessions they want to attend. In response to participants' comments, the Pennsylvania Service Corps' University in Dispersion program evolved from a lecture format to one that used role playing and simulations as training tools.

To avoid misunderstandings with sponsoring organizations, programs need to be very explicit about the priority they attach to education and training activities, the cooperation needed from the sponsoring organization, and the amount of time participants will be taken away from direct service.

Every Subtitle D program balances the sometimes competing goals of providing service to meet community needs and providing opportunities for participant development. To meet the goal of providing services to meet community needs, programs screen applicants for skills and knowledge, develop service projects primarily in terms of the community needs they meet, provide project-specific training, and limit the amount of time participants are taken away from service

projects because of other program activities. For example, the Pennsylvania Service Corps members gather for University-in-Dispersion education and training for an average of two days per month (less than 10 percent of the total service time available). The overwhelming majority of service time is available for direct service and capacity building. Participants are screened for skills and knowledge and the program provides project-specific training.

On the other hand, to meet the goal of providing opportunities for learning and individual development, programs screen applicants for motivation rather than for skills and knowledge, select service projects for the varied service learning opportunities they offer, and frequently bring participants together for education and training activities. Providing learning opportunities, including the opportunity to plan and manage service projects, tends to lower the quality of work done for sponsoring organizations because participants are unlikely to plan and manage projects as well as more experienced staff would do. Further, if participants are shifted from one role to another in order to maximize their learning experience, they do not become as skilled in any one role as they would if they worked on a single type of project.

Each program determines its own priorities between these two goals. The important operational point is that programs need to make their priorities clear to both participants and sponsoring organizations, and they need to do so throughout each cycle of participation. Problems occur when programs are not clear about the trade-off between service and learning, or when they take it for granted that participants or sponsoring organizations share the same expectations as program staff. For example, four programs take participants away from service sites one day per week for leadership development and other educational activities. In each of these programs, partner organizations have commented that, from their perspective, participants spend too much time away from the service site. Schools, in particular, have commented that students and staff would prefer to have participants on-site every day.

To a certain extent, effective programs are victims of their own success. The more useful the services they provide, the more they are pulled by partner organizations toward service and away from service learning and individual development. The problem is compounded in the case of part-time participants, who are available for service or other activities about one day per week.

Providing training for part-time participants has been difficult for Volunteer Maryland and

the Delta Service Corps. Part-time participants are often students or are employed and are therefore not readily available for lengthy residential basic training. Program staff say it is difficult to make sure part-time participants have the practical skills they need and to make them feel part of the program. Having them participate in the same in-service training activities as full-time participants may take a substantial part of their limited time commitment. For example, a representative of one Delta Service Corps partner organization was concerned that part-timers who only spend 10 hours per week in service may spend two to three of those hours at a team meeting, or occasionally an entire day at a corps function. While she understood the corpsmembers' obligations to the corps, she felt part-timers should not be away from their service sites so much.

3.3 SERVICE LEARNING

The most valued service learning opportunities have come when participants can use their practical experience in community service to plan and manage service projects. Programs should provide these opportunities on a systematic basis for all participants.

Although they must operate within the goals and objectives set for each service partnership, the demonstration programs have often been able to provide opportunities for participants themselves to plan and implement service projects. In City Year, for example, teams placed in schools are generally assigned to assist specific teachers or groups of students during the school day, but each team usually has the opportunity to plan and develop its own after-school projects. Although guided by team leaders, each team is encouraged to take responsibility for its own projects. Service learning comes from doing the actual planning and management, as well as from the monitoring and critical review of the projects by team leaders and service partners. Teams are challenged to apply the principles of community service taught in lectures and workshops, and the result is experiential education. In the Volunteer Maryland program, participants are entirely responsible for planning and implementing programs to recruit and mobilize volunteers.

When the evaluation team asked participants what they were learning from their experience in the programs, they almost always responded in terms of their particular service projects. They tended to focus on what they were learning about how to identify needs, plan service projects, and solve problems. The challenge for programs is to ensure that these opportunities are

systematically provided to all participants. Not all programs do this, and some kinds of service projects do not easily lend themselves to a high level of participant involvement in planning or management. This is particularly true of construction, environmental cleanup, and other physical service projects.

The more authority participants are given to plan and implement specific service projects, the more important it is for programs to provide them the necessary resources and skills to effectively monitor the progress of the projects so they can identify and resolve problems in a timely and effective manner. This entails a high level of support from team leaders. Even with this support, programs that allow participants substantial control of projects increase the risk that some projects will be unsuccessful. However, the learning opportunities are substantial.

One of the most compelling examples of this kind of experiential learning can be seen in the response of a City Year team to the mid-year cancellation of its primary service project because of lack of community interest and internal problems in the sponsoring organization. Several members of the team proposed to City Year staff that they use their mid-year internship period to develop a plan for a new City Year program. They proposed to adapt the basic City Year program model for an eighth-grade youth corps that would meet on Saturdays and give the students an opportunity to have a City Year-like experience. Drawing on their experience in the canceled project, they tested community interest in the program by holding a series of meetings and discussion groups at middle schools around the city to assess the interest of students and the feasibility of the plan. They developed an eight-week program that began with a day-long orientation at one of the Boston harbor islands and included six service days (four hours of service and two hours of workshop discussions) and a final graduation ceremony. With support from the program, they brought the proposal to their team sponsor, which agreed to provide financial support for supplies, tee-shirts for participants, and travel costs. The "City Youth" project was implemented in the last semester of the 1993-94 program year.

Programs have tried to provide this kind of experiential education through short-term team projects known as "signature projects." These projects provide an opportunity for participants to identify, plan, and work on a project together. These projects can be seen as training opportunities because they involve participants in all aspects of the service project. For example, a team of Delta

Service Corps participants established an information and referral center for a rural community. Participants identified office space, compiled a resource catalog, developed a tracking system for service utilization, and coordinated promotional activities. The housing team in the Public Allies program organized a series of workshops on tenant rights and information resources for residents of Chicago public housing. The team co-sponsored workshops along with the Chicago public housing authority.

To develop and implement effective field-based service learning activities that teach substantive lessons, programs should set educational objectives at the start of long-term service projects, and design exercises and assignments in which participants draw upon their service experiences.

The general pattern has been to rely upon team leaders to design and conduct field-based service learning, usually in the context of regular team meetings. The results are highly variable and largely dependent on the creativity and skills of team leaders. Some team leaders set out a series of educational objectives at the start of each long-term project, then design exercises and assignments in which participants use their experiences in actual service projects to complete the assignments. CVC has instituted this approach throughout its Subtitle D programs. Educational coordinators meet for a half-day every week with each team to assign and discuss writing and problem-solving exercises that are intended to relate specific service activities to a larger context of ideas and social policy. Most programs, however, rely entirely on team leaders, and few programs systematically extract best practices from the highly varied experiences of different teams and team leaders and compile these practices into a training manual that can be the basis for continuing development of field-based service learning.

The programs have not ignored these issues. Most rely upon regular "education days," and a few bring participants together for mid-year residential training sessions that are intended to draw upon the service experience to teach both skills and knowledge. City Year has the most comprehensive educational program. It includes on-site GED instruction, an eight-unit career development and planning curriculum, and day-long workshops on a variety of topics every Friday. Topics fall into four key themes: team functioning, tolerance and acceptance of diversity, current issues in educational and social policy, and substantive knowledge and technical skills required for specific service projects.

In the City Year, Public Allies, and Peach Corps programs, weekly education days provide opportunities for all or a large proportion of the corps' members to assemble, reflect on recent experiences, and participate in learning activities. The Pennsylvania Service Corps calls its continuing education component the University-in-Dispersion. It consists of monthly two-day sessions providing instruction in skills and topics identified by participants. The New Jersey Urban Schools Service Corps' monthly in-service training sessions include a combination of issues-based sessions such as after-school programs, mentoring, literacy, and community service programs for children, and personal and professional development workshops on topics such as communication and team-building.

Because participants are distributed over a wide geographic area, the Delta Service Corps relies on team leaders to provide service learning and other educational opportunities as part of their team meetings with participants. The frequency of these meetings varies from once a week to once every few weeks. Team leaders encourage reflection on service activities as well as conduct sessions on academic and career planning and civic and community education. The Delta Service Corps also sponsors a mid-year "Super Training," which provides an opportunity for corpsmembers to gather as a group and attend more formal training sessions that could not be organized efficiently at the team level. City Year also brings staff and participants together for a mid-year retreat to discuss service projects from the preceding semester and plan for the coming semester.

CHAPTER FOUR

PROVIDING SERVICE TO MEET COMMUNITY NEEDS

The primary activity of the Subtitle D programs is providing services to meet community needs. The National and Community Service Act of 1990 directs programs to:

- ⊘ Place participants in areas within the state to provide the "optimum match between community needs and anticipated supply of participants,"
- ⊘ Recruit and select "sponsoring organizations that will receive participants,"
- ⊘ Match "participants with sponsoring organizations," and
- ⊘ Place "participants in teams or individual placements."

Most of the service projects undertaken by the Subtitle D programs are substantial in scope and duration. They address a broad range of community needs and involve partnerships with a variety of public agencies, community organizations, and private sponsors. All the national service demonstration programs work through a network of linkages in local communities to identify community needs, develop service opportunities, and build partnerships to carry out service projects. In this chapter, we discuss the development and implementation of service projects, particularly the ways in which programs establish and sustain productive service partnerships, develop service projects, and promote service quality.¹

4.1 BUILDING SERVICE PARTNERSHIPS

Collaboration between programs and sponsoring organizations is important in ensuring that needed services are provided to the community and that participants have a positive learning experience. Programs should approach sponsoring organizations as "service partners" rather than simply as "host sites."

All Subtitle D programs reach out to public agencies and community organizations. Most

1. The final evaluation report will examine the completion of service projects, including their accomplishments, the value of services provided, and the satisfaction of sponsoring organizations and beneficiaries.

invest considerable staff resources introducing themselves to local agencies and organizations throughout their areas of service. While much of this is done through press releases and direct mail letters and brochures, all of the programs have also taken the effort to visit local agencies and organizations. During site visits, program staff have an opportunity to more thoroughly explore the mission, resources, and needs of the organization, while at the same time they can introduce their own program, explaining its own objectives, resources, and needs.

Two programs were designed around specific partnerships. The New Jersey Urban School Service Corps first selected participating schools from among those with fully developed, operational Comer School Reform programs. Then the program recruited full-time participants from within the neighborhoods in the schools' attendance areas. Team leaders are actually hired by the individual schools and are jointly supervised by the program and the school. Similarly, the Kansas Health and Safety Corps depends upon a partnership with the Cooperative Extension Service in each participating town. The Service provides office space and logistical support, as well as the base from which participants develop projects and provide services.

The Subtitle D programs have generally defined community needs by working collaboratively with partner agencies in local communities. The programs begin with the assumption that local communities know their own needs and priorities better than outsiders do, and they recognize that they can deflect local opposition by working jointly with existing agencies and organizations in their target communities. This holds true for both dispersed and concentrated programs, in both urban and rural locations.

The experience of City Year in a low-income, minority community in Boston provides an instructive example of how a national service program can respond positively and constructively to local opposition. The program's first service project was rehabilitation of a playground in the Roxbury neighborhood of Boston in 1988. Beginning from that base, the program developed partnerships with community organizations and schools in the neighborhood and undertook several major service projects each year. Nonetheless, City Year came to encounter growing local opposition focused on the fact that it was a "downtown" program with ample and secure funding, coming into a community that has seen locally initiated programs plagued by limited and insecure funding.

City Year responded by meeting with its local critics, listening to their criticism, inviting them to sit on a community advisory board, and opening a field office in the community. When it organized its teams geographically for the 1993-94 program year, all the teams working on projects in Roxbury were grouped into one division that was based in the new field office. Finally, the program hired a long-time community activist to be in charge of the office. Useful as it was in practical terms, the new field office was even more important for its symbolic value for its acknowledgment of the legitimacy of local concerns evidence of and the program's commitment to partnership.

Effective service partnerships require partner agencies that are committed to the goals of national service programs and prepared to invest the necessary resources, time, and staff commitment to achieve these goals. The most common reason why projects and partnerships fail is that the partner agencies are unable to deliver the required material resources, planning help, supervision, or staff assistance.

Strong service projects require strong service partners, and strong service partners are those prepared to make the necessary commitment to developing service projects, providing learning opportunities for participants, and monitoring the progress of both participants and projects.

This fundamental principle is illustrated by the difficulties that City Year encountered in completing a long-term service project developed in partnership with a community organization in a small industrial town just outside Boston. The organization occupied an aging two-story building badly in need of repair, and was struggling to raise sufficient funds for renovation. City Year agreed to place a crew at the organization to do physical work connected with the renovation and also to develop programs for neighborhood children that could be offered at the newly renovated center. The organization agreed to provide architectural plans, help from licensed plumbers and electricians, construction materials, and tools. In the first semester, the crew completed the necessary demolition work to prepare the site for new plumbing and wiring, to be done while the crew dispersed for mid-year internships and training. During the break, the organization was unable to obtain the necessary plumbing and electrical work, and also all the necessary construction materials. The organization had overestimated its ability to raise contributions. When the City Year team was ready to return, none of the required work had been completed. The team was

ultimately reassigned to a beach cleanup project.

The team leader pointed out the irony of the situation. Had the organization been more open and forthcoming about its fundraising problems, that is, had the organization approached City Year in a spirit of partnership, the City Year may have been able to provide timely help in developing an effective, targeted fundraising strategy that would have allowed the project to be completed.

Commitment may be the single most important factor in maintaining partnerships. An example of how commitment from the sponsor and the program can overcome a series of difficulties can be seen in a partnership between the Delta Service Corps and a private nonprofit organization providing social services to senior citizens. The director of the organization submitted an application for a project to conduct outreach to identify low-income, frail elderly residents of the community and coordinate needed social services for them. She asked to have two participants placed at her organization, one to concentrate on outreach and one on coordination of services, and referred two suitable local women to the Delta Service Corps. Both women were familiar with service agencies in the community and interested in the welfare of the frail elderly population. Unfortunately, neither woman was ultimately able to enroll; one was injured in an automobile accident, and the other was unwilling to attend orientation and training because she would not be allowed to bring her young child along.

The Delta Service Corps then referred several participants to the organization. After interviewing them, the director selected two candidates to fill the positions. None of the candidates, including the two she eventually selected, had the experience or skill level the director had in mind for the project. Although the director was disappointed in the skill level of the participants, she was committed to the partnership and agreed to work closely with the team leader to redefine the project tasks and schedule to fit the skill levels of the participants. She also agreed to include a significant level of in-service training.

Programs should be encouraged to use the site recruitment and selection process to inform community organizations about the mission of the program, measure the commitment and capabilities of potential service partners, and develop the capacity of local agencies and organizations to identify and attack community needs. To further ensure the commitment of the partner agencies, programs should be encouraged to provide initial orientation and training sessions for service partners that are parallel in purpose to those provided participants.

The process of site recruitment and selection usually begins with community outreach in the form of press releases (including public service announcements), direct mail, and presentations to interest groups and to specific agencies and organizations. The programs developed their own application forms tailored to local objectives and circumstances, which potential service sponsors or partners were asked to complete; each program substantially revised its application forms for the second program year, including state-specific adjustments. A typical site application form, used by the Louisiana Delta Service Corps, is shown in Exhibit 4.1; it asks for narrative responses to 12 questions. Review of written applications is usually followed by site visits, which allow program staff to observe the actual setting and operation of the organization and provide a check on the validity of the information in the application.

Exhibit 4.1
Questions from the Delta Service Corps Site Application

1. What is the purpose of your organization?
2. What are the major activities of your organization?
3. What experience does your agency have in volunteer management? How do you recruit and organize volunteers?
4. How has your agency successfully served the community?
5. What is the community need your Delta Service Corps project addresses? Why is it a need?
6. Describe the Delta Service Corps project and how it will meet the community need.
7. What will the Delta Service Corpsmember do to carry out this project?
8. Why can't a paid employee do this work?
9. Who will supervise the Delta Service Corpsmembers?
10. What opportunities for personal and professional development will your organization provide the Delta Service Corp member assigned to you?
11. What plans does the agency have for insuring sustainability after the Delta Service Corps assignment is complete?
12. What other organizations will work with you on this project and how will they help?

Final decisions are made by a selection committee, usually consisting of selected program staff, often supplemented by representative team leaders and participants, and sometimes including representatives of other agencies as well. The Arkansas Delta Service Corps, for example, divides its jurisdiction into eastern and western sections. The site application review committees for each section include representatives of agencies and organizations from the other section. This provides the program with the benefit of critical scrutiny from experienced service organizations and reduces conflict of interest problems.

Review of site proposals allows the programs to determine whether the proposed service projects actually address critical community needs. If not, the programs have the opportunity to work with the potential partner agencies to refine their proposals to more specifically identify and address pressing community needs. Minor refinements can be made as part of the current application process. Applications that need more substantial development and revision will be rejected, but the agencies will be given specific comments on what needs to be done to improve the application and encouraged to submit a proposal in the next outreach cycle.

The experience of Volunteer Maryland is typical of what most programs found. In its first year, the program focused on finding partner agencies that could most benefit from its services. But by the middle of the year, program staff recognized that up to one-quarter of the partner agencies were not fully committed to developing a strong volunteer program—that is, they were "needy" but not "ready." To remedy this situation, the site selection process in the second year focused on more thoroughly explaining and testing the commitment required of potential service partners.

A site selection committee was appointed, including three participants, representatives from three nonprofit organizations, a site supervisor from a partner agency, and members of the program's own Advisory Board. The committee read the 102 applications submitted, focusing on whether the proposed projects met true community needs and whether the agency understood the magnitude of its commitment. If these tests were met, agencies were invited to attend one-hour interview sessions with representatives of the selection committee. Interviews were held with 65 agencies over a 16-day period. Agencies whose applications needed more revision were offered technical assistance from a program participant, who visited them, questioned them about their proposal, and then recommended either that they go on to the next step or be deferred to a later

application cycle.

All potential partner agencies were asked to write a self-assessment and to outline a strategy for how the agency would get ready to support the project, including developing plans for participant orientation and supervision. Volunteer Maryland participants visited the top 50 applicants for a half day to meet with staff and observe the agency in action. Volunteer Maryland staff then developed memoranda of understanding that spelled out the expectations and obligations of both the program and the partner agency. Partner agencies were asked to attend two days of orientation to identify potential pitfalls and prevention strategies, share volunteer program plans and develop their own network of support. Through the entire process, the program reiterated its primary mission to increase the number of volunteers doing direct service and the values it promotes: diversity of age, race, experience, and education, and the human potential of the coordinators. Each partner agency was also told repeatedly that the program guarantees that the coordinators will learn volunteer management techniques, but that the agency must ensure that adequate facilities, resources, and support are available to the participant.

Public Allies begins a similar process on a more informal note. It hosts an informational breakfast for potential partners. Representatives from interested host agencies are provided with information about Public Allies and about the expectations of the sponsoring agencies. Potential partners are encouraged to ask questions of the Allies program and to offer ideas about partnerships. Agencies are mailed host organization applications and must, with the application, provide specific details about the responsibilities and objectives of a placement. Each site receives at least one visit by Allies staff during the competitive selection process. The program has also changed the focus of its presentation to potential service partners to more clearly emphasize the responsibilities of the partner agency. In the first year, the program focused on what a participant could do for the partner agency. For its second year, the program intends to focus on how the participant and partner agency can complement and benefit each other.

4.2 DEVELOPING SERVICE PROJECTS

Service projects range from short-term (1-3 months) to long-term (8-12 months); most projects are substantial in scope and duration. Programs need to recognize that, while such projects offer an opportunity to provide an enhanced learning experience for

participants, they also require a high level of involvement and commitment from the sponsoring organization.

Participants have been placed at a broad and diverse array of host organizations, including elementary schools, high schools, colleges, universities, local government agencies, county government offices, state government agencies, community-based nonprofit agencies, and foundations.

Each service partnership tends to generate a variety of specific service projects. Taken as a whole, these projects meet a variety of community needs and most (80 percent) last eight months or more. Exhibit 4.2 displays the distribution of service projects by duration.

Exhibit 4.2

Almost three-fourths (72 percent) of service projects meet multiple community needs. For example, a Volunteer Maryland project conducted in partnership with a community organization in Baltimore recruits volunteers to act as school-based advocates and one-on-one mentors to small groups of children. The Volunteer Maryland participants help recruit and monitor community volunteers, act as liaisons to the mentors, and organize after-school activities and workshops in coordination with the sponsoring organizations and mentors. The project is intended to lower the dropout rate and improve the life chances of inner-city public school students. Thus it meets both educational and human service needs.

Similarly, four participants in the Pennsylvania Service Corps are assigned as team leaders in the Philadelphia Ranger Corps, a program that trains youth to be urban park rangers in the city's large Fairmount Park system. Rangers patrol the parks and lead environmental education workshops in schools and for the general public. Rangers also manage the Summer Park Conservation Corps, which undertakes rebuilding and cleanup efforts throughout the park system. As part of their required supplemental community service, rangers also serve as mentors and counselors in community centers and visit nursing homes. As team leaders, the participants from the Pennsylvania Service Corps are involved in all these activities.

The Delta Service Corps provides a third example of a service partnership that generates projects that are substantial in scope and duration and address multiple community needs, in this case both environmental and public safety needs. Working with several community groups, the participant organizes projects to help prevent coastal erosion along Louisiana's southern beaches. Such erosion control measures help lessen the damage from hurricanes. Collaborating with another Delta Service Corps participant, he also does presentations on hurricane preparedness for schools and community groups.

Education and human needs are the most common focus of service projects. To expand significantly beyond these kinds of projects, programs will have to become part of the long-term strategy of public agencies and community organizations that focus on other issues, such as public safety or the environment.

The focus on education and human needs appears to be due primarily to the fact that schools and community organizations are traditional settings for community service activities and

are able to quickly offer a variety of service opportunities. Environmental projects are the next most common, although they are often of shorter duration. The schools and community-based organizations that provide the setting for service projects in these three areas tend to use volunteers in a variety of capacities and can adapt established routines to accommodate program participants and develop service projects. Agencies and organizations in the field of public safety tend to have less of an institutional capacity to accommodate participants, and it takes more time and developmental effort to negotiate service opportunities in this setting.

4.3 PROMOTING SERVICE QUALITY

Programs should be encouraged to set measurable objectives for service projects and monitor the progress of projects against these objectives. The objectives should include participant development and service quality.

Clear program objectives should be specified before the project begins. Of course many projects evolve over the course of a partnership, but it is critical to monitor progress regularly against original or revised objectives in order to identify and resolve problems as they begin to emerge, at a point where they can be resolved most easily. Effective monitoring requires that milestones be established for each service project and that all parties (program, participant, partner agency) be open to review and criticism. Some projects simply have unrealistic expectations and underestimate the true level of effort required to accomplish their objectives. Timely monitoring would allow adjustment of schedule, objectives, or commitment of resources.

Other kinds of projects are not easily measured by milestones and require other kinds of indicators, such as satisfaction ratings. These include, for example, the variety of projects in which participants work in schools as teacher's aides, tutors, or facilitators of special projects.

In many ways, monitoring the progress of specific service projects is actually an indirect method of gauging the quality of the partnership. It is a way of testing whether the partnership has in fact developed service and learning opportunities for participants, whether the services provided are meeting expectations, and whether the partner agency is providing the requisite resources and supervision.

There is an almost inevitable tendency for service partners to absorb participants into the ordinary flow of work at the agency. This is particularly true for individual placements, where

participants may be asked to help out with a variety of tasks, such as answering the phone, helping with a delivery, or doing photocopying. These kinds of requests need to be judged individually and in context. On the one hand, programs require that partner agencies agree not to use participants for routine chores or to provide services to the agency, but to concentrate their efforts on service projects that benefit the community. On the other hand, supervisors at partner agencies look for the same level of commitment to the agency that they expect from their own regular staff and volunteers, and they object to participants who resist helping out. Left unexamined, these apparently trivial conflicts can erode the relationship between the partner agency and the participant, leaving both frustrated and dissatisfied. Both are also inclined to attribute the problem to the program, so it is very much in the program's own self-interest to spend the time on-site, talking and observing, to monitor the full range of expectations of all parties.

Programs should be encouraged to make their own adjustments based on what they learn from careful monitoring and evaluation of service projects.

Programs have successfully implemented changes as a result of lessons learned from the experiences of their participants in different service projects and settings. For example, one participant in the initial enrollment class of the Pennsylvania Service Corps who was placed at a community center saw the scope and direction of her service project completely altered after the appointment of a new supervisor. Seeing the participant only as another "volunteer," the new supervisor assigned her routine chores such as opening mail, answering telephones, and performing other secretarial tasks. The participant initially accepted the new duties as "part of the program," but soon became bored and disillusioned, particularly when she realized that she probably would not have the opportunity to implement her original service project plan. Meetings between the team leader and site supervisor were unable to resolve the issue. The participant was finally reassigned to another organization.

As a result of the experiences of this participant and others in the inaugural class, more frequent and formal monitoring of placements was introduced. The program was able to relieve the burden on the original two field coordinators by recruiting and hiring a third coordinator. Additionally, the entire host site recruitment and site-participant matching process was reviewed and modified.

Programs should focus on the kinds of projects that most effectively exploit their specific resources.

For example, for the 1993-94 program year City Year decided to concentrate its service partnerships on agencies and organizations that serve youth. From its inception, the program had a presence in elementary schools, and it expanded from this base to include younger children in Head Start and day care programs, older children in middle school, and children of various ages in after-school programs at community centers. In a parallel effort, it has begun to systematically mine its own experience to identify what it refers to as "quality service products," that is, models of exemplary projects that have been developed by various teams and can be used by other teams. Examples would include a curriculum for a third-grade music program, a plan for a middle-school newspaper, and a set of diversity exercises particularly appropriate for elementary school students. Rather than starting from scratch in developing service projects, new teams can begin with a stock of "proven products" available.

Volunteer Maryland, with its focus on volunteer management, is a program that has had this sort of focus from its inception; the same is true of the Kansas Health and Safety Extension Corps. Most college and university placements in the Pennsylvania Service Corps are asked to implement or coordinate volunteer centers on their respective campuses. The corpsmembers work on campus to recruit and organize student, staff and faculty volunteers and work off campus to screen and match agencies with needs.

CHAPTER FIVE

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

In this chapter, we discuss organizational context and staffing. Among the nine Subtitle D programs, four are operated by agencies of state government, four by private nonprofit organizations, and one by a consortium of state agencies and private nonprofit organizations. We consider the relative advantages and disadvantages of each type of setting. *The experience of the Subtitle D programs suggests that private nonprofit organizations have more flexibility, fewer restrictions, and more success in raising private funds than do state agencies.*

We then look at issues of staff size, training, and responsibilities. *The experience of the Subtitle D programs demonstrates the key role played by team leaders in providing direction and support for service projects, facilitating service learning, and ensuring service quality.*

Only agencies of state government were eligible to receive national service grants under Subtitle D. In four cases, the state agency that received the grant also has direct administrative responsibility for program operations. These are the Georgia Peach Corps, the New Jersey Urban School Service Corps, Volunteer Maryland, and the Kansas Health and Safety Corps. In four other cases, the state agency retains fiscal responsibility, but a private nonprofit organization administers and operates the program. These are City Year, the Pennsylvania Service Corps, Public Allies, and the City Volunteer Corps. The Delta Service Corps presents a distinctive administrative model combining public agencies and private nonprofit organizations. The grantee is an Arkansas state agency (the Division of Volunteerism in the state Department of Human Services), which assumes fiscal responsibility and coordinates the three state programs. Operational responsibility is allocated quite differently across the three states. The Arkansas Delta Service Corps is operated jointly by two private nonprofit organizations; the Mississippi Delta Service Corps is operated by the state Department of Education; and the Louisiana Delta Service Corps is operated by the Lieutenant Governor's office.

The general pattern among the Subtitle D programs is to employ a relatively small number of program staff, including a program director, an education coordinator, several regional coordinators responsible for recruitment and selection of service partners and participants, and a group of team leaders responsible for day-to-day supervision of participants and service projects.

Depending on whether the program is administered by a state agency or a private nonprofit, there may also be administrative staff responsible for financial management and information reporting.

5.1 ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING

Resting operational responsibility for national service programs in state agencies provides infrastructure resources such as financial management, but also exposes programs to delays and loss of flexibility. As part of the grant negotiation process, the Corporation should ensure that state agencies have identified and addressed potential bureaucratic barriers to implementation.

Although programs benefitted from the wide range of resources potentially available through state government, including access to well-established financial and other management systems, every program encountered delays and other difficulties because of dependence on state government. The problems were most obvious in the programs where the state agencies receiving the grant also retained operational responsibility for the program. Infrastructure support is both the strength and the liability of working through government agencies.

Programs within state agencies are subject to government policy many levels removed from their immediate concerns. For example, a state hiring freeze in New Jersey left half the authorized staff positions unfilled for most of the first year of operations. In addition, state action is closely circumscribed by detailed administrative rules and procedures that control the circumstances of hiring, contracting, procurement, staff responsibilities, supervision, discipline, and benefits. These bureaucratic state procedures sometimes slow the pace of implementation and constrain a program's freedom of action. For example, the Georgia Peach Corps was required to assign participants to a classification in the state personnel system; the only classification available was one that precluded payment of health insurance benefits.

Bureaucratic problems are most pressing during startup. The experience of the Pennsylvania Service Corps dramatically illustrates the point. The state grantee contracted operational responsibility for the program to a private nonprofit organization, the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities (PACU). This was done in part to avoid cumbersome administrative procedures and in part to take advantage of PACU's special expertise and established relationships. The state Department of Labor and Industry is the formal grantee and program

participants receive stipends and benefits through the state personnel system. Complex administrative requirements, including formal legislative approval of the federal grant, contributed to an unexpected four-month delay in startup. Until the contract was approved, PACU was unable to hire any staff except the executive director. Lack of staff delayed recruitment of participants and service partners, as well as curriculum development for the program's continuing education component. As a result, the first class cycle was quite small and the program was not fully implemented until nine months after the grant was awarded.

Bureaucratic obstacles can be lessened when grants are awarded to state agencies that are comparatively small and have missions closely aligned with the mission of the national service program.

Volunteer Maryland offers a telling example. The program model was developed by the Governor's Advisory Board on Service and Citizenship, which selected the Governor's Office of Volunteerism as the most appropriate administrative setting. The program has its own offices outside the state capitol and is guided by an Advisory Board appointed by the Governor and composed of individuals with substantial commitment to community service and experience in volunteer action. Volunteer Maryland was able to take advantage of the state infrastructure, but was effectively insulated from bureaucratic delays and could implement its program on schedule.

Resting operational responsibility in nonprofit organizations provides more flexibility and facilitates quick response to emerging issues, although it requires development or expansion of fiscal and other management systems.

Because only agencies of state government were eligible to receive funds under Subtitle D, each of the five private nonprofit organizations operating Subtitle D programs is a subgrantee of a state agency sponsor. Under subcontract to the state agency grantee, each nonprofit organization has complete authority over the operation of the program. Pennsylvania decided during preparation of its initial design to contract with the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities (PACU), a private nonprofit organization, to operate its program. In three other states, the program model was entirely conceived by a private nonprofit organization formed specifically to operate a community service program. City Year developed its program model and secured private funding to operate for two years before the federal grant became available. Similarly, Public Allies

developed and implemented its program model in Washington, D.C., with private money, then collaborated with the Illinois Lieutenant Governor's office to expand to Chicago. The Lieutenant Governor's office acts as grant recipient and assumes fiscal responsibility for the grant, while Public Allies exercises operational control. The City Volunteer Corps (CVC) in New York was established with city funds and has more than ten years of operational experience. CVC developed its national service demonstration program model specifically to address problems it perceived in its established youth corps model, and approached state government to act as the grant recipient and assume fiscal responsibility for the grant while CVC itself retained full operational control. All three nonprofit organizations have a single focus; the mission of the program also defines the mission of the organization. Subject only to financial constraints, they have the flexibility to respond immediately to emerging issues or problems.

The experiences of the three states in the Delta Service Corps highlights and reinforces the lessons discussed in this section. Based in a very large state agency, the Mississippi program has been unable to fill its full set of staff positions and has had considerable staff turnover. In a much smaller agency setting, the Louisiana program has been able to focus on its mission and hire staff with few bureaucratic obstacles. The Arkansas state program had all the advantages of flexibility that come from a nonprofit organization. The program has also been able to draw upon experienced staff who "speak the language" of nonprofit organizations and they have found that this has made it much easier to recruit nonprofit organizations as service partners.

The Delta Service Corps also offers a distinctive model of multi-state administration and management—a true collaboration rather than a hierarchical structure with a central office and local branches or affiliates. The Corporation should not reject alternative and innovative organizational settings for national service programs.

Collaborative management is a difficult and time-consuming task. The Delta Service Corps' central office provides overall coordination of effort among the three states, contracts for multi-state training and education activities, and is responsible for fiscal management and reporting to the Commission. Each state program has substantial autonomy in adapting the general policies and approach of the Delta Service Corps to meet its own particular circumstances, resources, opportunities, and needs. To make this model work, and to assure common direction and focus, the

state directors and the central office staff invest a significant amount of time and effort in periodic meetings and weekly teleconferences. All decision-making is by consensus; unresolved issues are deferred until a consensus is reached. The real lesson is the possibility of preserving a high level of local autonomy with substantial and sustained commitment from local partners.

Private nonprofit organizations have substantial advantages over state agencies in raising funds from the private sector.

Government agencies face a difficult task in attempting to raise private funds to support their community service programs; as a result, the Subtitle D programs have had limited success in raising private contributions to supplement their federal grants. Potential contributors tend to feel that they are already supporting state agency programs through their tax payments. Moreover, state agency staff have little experience and therefore little expertise in fundraising. Indeed, many state agencies do not even have a financial management system that allows for private contributions.

City Year, a private nonprofit organization, provides perhaps the most compelling model of effective fundraising. The organization has a specific unit (with eight staff members) dedicated to raising funds from foundations, the business sector, and the general public. One of its most successful fundraising methods is the concept of team sponsorships.

The organization solicits private firms to sponsor teams. City Year cites its national reputation and appeals to firms to make an investment in the future and in their own communities by supporting youth service. In return for their contribution (\$70,000 for the 1993-94 program year), team sponsors get high visibility. The City Year tee-shirts that all team members wears carry the name of the sponsor and each team is identified in the program by reference to its sponsor. In 1993-94, there was a Reebok team, a Timberland team, and a Boston Lawyers team (sponsored by a group of law firms). One participant on each team is assigned to be the sponsor liaison and maintain regular communication, responding to sponsor questions or requests and providing regular updates on the progress of the team and its service projects. Sponsors are invited to send small groups of employees to "spend a day at City Year" working alongside the team and participating in a discussion over lunch. Sponsors in turn are encouraged to invite their teams to attend or make presentations at different corporate events such as annual meetings. Teams are encouraged to be

imaginative in responding to sponsor requests. One sponsor invited its team to attend the annual Christmas party and the team asked permission to bring a choir it had organized at its elementary school.

5.2 STAFFING

The programs generally follow a geographically based organization.

The demonstration programs have found that they can develop more effective service projects if they invest a significant portion of staff time in building local relationships—explaining the goals and objectives of national service in local communities, learning about community needs, identifying potential resources, and enlisting local support. All this is more efficiently done with an organizational structure that is based on geography rather than on substantive issues.

The Delta Service Corps is the largest and most sprawling program. It provides services in portions of three states and has service projects in all major cities (Little Rock, Jackson, Baton Rouge, and New Orleans) as well as in the thinly populated, economically depressed rural counties throughout the Delta. For day-to-day management, the program is organized in a geographically based structure. Each state has its own director and support staff. Participants, dispersed in individual placements in different organizations and communities, are grouped into teams on the basis of contiguity. A city may have several teams, while rural areas may have teams scattered over four or five counties. Each team is supervised by a team leader, who is also responsible for monitoring service projects and maintaining relations with local agencies and organizations.

While this may seem a natural form of organization for any program that spans a large expanse of territory, local programs have also found that it has benefits. Until the 1993-94 program year, City Year was organized thematically, that is, teams were grouped into divisions by service focus. The idea was to pool substantive expertise. However, one consequence of this form of organization was that the program as a whole did not have consistent lines of communication with local officials and community leaders, and it was difficult to develop and sustain cooperative relations and a longitudinal strategy for community change. Consequently, City Year modified its basic structure, organizing teams into neighborhood-based divisions.

The team leader staff position is a critical one in nearly every program. Programs should clearly define the scope of responsibility and priorities for team leaders.

Virtually every program has developed team leader or regional coordinator positions to provide front-line supervision of participants and mediate among the sometimes competing demands of service partners, participants, and program administration. It is the team leader's responsibility to maintain the proper balance between the objectives of service quality and participant development. While all programs provide continuing education, team leaders are usually responsible for much of the field-based service learning that occurs. The only program without team leaders is the Kansas Health and Safety Extension Corps, a small, highly dispersed program whose entire enrollment would constitute no more than a small team with the project director as de facto team leader. In the other programs, teams are typically composed of 10 to 15 participants.

The experience of Volunteer Maryland demonstrates the importance of the team leader position. Because the program was comparatively small and participants were scattered throughout the state, in its first program year state staff assumed responsibility for monitoring and supervision of participants and service projects. As the year went on, the staff learned that effective monitoring required a high degree of on-site presence and first-hand knowledge. Although state staff met quarterly with each service partner and convened two meetings of all participants and site representatives, the staff were distant from most of the sites and often occupied with other responsibilities. As a result, it was difficult to respond promptly and proactively as issues arose. For its second program year, Volunteer Maryland divided the state into five regions and hired five former participants to serve as regional coordinators, each supervising teams of ten to fourteen participants. The coordinators have office space at organizations in their regions and are expected to meet regularly on-site with participants and their supervisors.

To ensure that team leaders have authority, access to resources, and independence from sponsoring organizations, it is useful but not essential for them to be paid program staff.

The general pattern among the demonstration programs is for team leaders to be paid program staff, recruited and supervised by the program. This gives the program complete control over hiring and supervision of the team leader.

A different approach is seen in the New Jersey Urban School Service Corps, where team leaders are recruited and selected by the individual schools where teams are placed. Although they are paid by the state program from grant funds, individual districts can supplement leaders' salaries. This results in substantial pay disparities and some tension among different team leaders. Team leaders are considered to be site coordinators, responsible as much to the school as to the program. They are directly supervised by the school principal or the school planning and management team, although they also meet regularly with state field coordinators. This arrangement gives the program only limited influence on hiring and supervision, although it ensures that team leaders have close relationships with the local school.

A third approach is used by the Delta Service Corps, where team leaders are participants rather than paid staff. They are selected in the course of the standard application process and given additional training. They have the same responsibilities as team leaders in the other programs and the same supervisory relationship with participants. The team leaders comment, however, that they have a stronger bond between themselves and the members of their team precisely because they are participants committed to the mission of the program, and not paid staff.

To ensure that team leaders have enough timely information about the progress of participants and service projects to identify and resolve problems, programs should ensure that team leaders spend significant amounts of time on site at sponsoring organizations.

One of the ongoing challenges for all the national service demonstration programs is to ensure that team leaders can be regularly present on-site to meet with supervisors from the sponsoring organizations, talk with participants, and observe the work they are doing. Regular and sustained contact gives team leaders the first-hand knowledge and feel for the situation that is necessary to properly assess the quality of the services being provided, determine whether participants truly have opportunities for learning and personal development, and identify any potential problems. However, team leaders often have other program responsibilities as well—for example, helping to recruit new service partners, completing required forms and other paperwork, or serving on planning or management committees. All these responsibilities take them away from their teams and their service sites. In the case of crew-based programs, this is not much of a

problem because team leaders can still be on-site with their teams almost every day. It is quite a different situation in individual placement programs, however, where teams are dispersed among different agencies in a city or region, and team leaders have to travel the circuit to stay in contact with participants and service partners.

Programs should strive to provide a high level of staff training and support in order to develop and retain a capable and dedicated staff, committed to the mission of the program.

The demonstration programs have demanded a high level of commitment from all staff members, particularly team leaders but central office staff as well. A team leader from one program described his role as "a calling, not a job." However, most of the demonstration programs have concentrated their efforts on developing service projects and deploying participants; few have given much attention to staff development.

In part because it is further along the development cycle, City Year is an exception. The program recognizes the importance of explicitly identifying and sustaining its distinctive vision and its organizational culture, and ensuring that its staff members have the skills needed to meet their responsibilities. City Year does this in part through staff retreats and regular meetings, and it has also developed a four-week staff training academy that was held for the first time in the summer of 1994.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The experiences of the Subtitle D programs provide a series of useful lessons that are relevant to the new national service programs established in AmeriCorps. We have summarized the most important of these lessons in the Exhibits 6.1 through 6.4 at the end of this chapter. In this chapter, we comment on the overarching themes that give unity and coherence to these lessons.

Vision. Programs need to measure their performance against a broad *vision* of the purpose and promise of national service. At a minimum, and at its most practical level, a program's vision should articulate the basic principles of national service and its own particular mission. Once basic principles are clearly stated, programs must apply them in day-to-day program operations—in community outreach, in seeking sponsor support, in establishing relationships with service partners, in selecting participants, in creating learning opportunities, and in monitoring the progress of service projects. Many of the specific lessons we have drawn in this report restate and elaborate the importance of the basic proposition that programs need to define and measure themselves in terms of their mission. In general, the Subtitle D programs see their mission as twofold, providing: (1) needed services to meet critical community needs, and (2) structured opportunities for education and personal development through the experience of service.

Programs need a vision, not only for its practical value but also to sustain their own sense of identity and value and their place in the community. They need a vision that defines their meaning and significance, that justifies the level of commitment they ask from staff, participants, and service partners. Programs need to be able to express their reason for being, a vision of the difference their efforts can make, not only for the individuals and organizations they affect directly but also for the larger society of which they are part.

Collaboration. Much of what the programs accomplish is achieved through collaboration. The programs have the potential to create, expand, and sustain ties across the fault lines of society—among participants, through the emphasis on diversity in age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, and personal differences; among public agencies and community organizations, through partnerships and shared planning; and among citizens at large, through public events including highly visible service projects.

At their best, the programs build networks of cooperation and shared effort. With their emphasis on diversity and their attention to team-building and education, they bring together very different individuals who learn to recognize both differences and similarities among themselves. Participants build relationships and understanding across the barriers of gender, income, age, and race that would typically separate them from one another. Deployed among a variety of public agencies and community organizations, participants carry the value of diversity with them. Working collaboratively with service partners, the programs can also build linkages among agencies and organizations in the community. In individual placement programs, these linkages are further developed through team meetings that bring participants together to share information and ideas about the community issues their different projects address. Participants can be a stimulant for the exchange of ideas among different organizations.

The programs try to fill the gaps left open by government action and market forces in providing necessary services to meet community needs. Further, the programs can foster innovation and imagination by bringing together diverse individuals with widely varying talents and abilities, and allowing participants to take responsibility for planning and directing service projects. They are almost unique in their ability and determination to bring together such disparate groups of individuals for common, peaceful effort.

Cycle of Development. All programs must go through a *natural cycle of development*. This cycle can be accelerated through investment in *continuous improvement*. City Year is the most mature of the national service demonstration programs and its experience is a useful indicator of the natural curve of development that new national services programs can expect. The experiences of the other programs during their first two years suggest that the City Year experience is generalizable.

In their first year, programs focused entirely on basic operational requirements—recruiting participants, developing service opportunities, and mastering the necessary logistical requirements (e.g., details of pay, uniforms, manuals, supervision, and problem resolution). As they moved into their second year, the programs made adjustments in the nature of service partnerships (selection process, expectations, monitoring) and they also began to focus on the quality of the participant experience. In their second and third years, they developed more specific education and training

materials, added support services such as counseling, and began to confront the issue of post-program planning. In their fourth and fifth years, with participant support structures in place, concerns with service quality and community impacts can be expected to predominate.

The extent to which the programs are willing to learn from their own experiences is striking. All the programs conduct some structured evaluation of their service projects and partnerships. City Year, for example, asks service partners and participants to complete mid-year and end-of-project written evaluation forms, and program staff meet with service partners to assess the partnership during the program's mid-year break. Some of the results are coded and entered into a data base, but much of the information is in narrative form. While this can be absorbed and analyzed for individual projects, it is not systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed. City Year has begun to compile information more systematically and document its collective experience, but analysis and synthesis remains a daunting task. It is, however, precisely what is necessary if the program is to systematically learn from its experience. The same holds true for the other programs, most of which are not yet compiling information systematically.

Some of this need is being met at present by local evaluators. Also, under Subtitle D funding, staff from the former Commission on National and Community Service encouraged and supported programs to do this through intensive site visits and regular workshops where programs were expected to take the lead in identifying issues and presenting their own solutions. In AmeriCorps, the Corporation for National Service requires programs to set annual objectives, report quarterly on progress toward achieving these objectives, develop procedures to gauge the quality and impact of their work, and solicit review and comment from key stakeholders. Further, the Corporation plans to hold a variety of conferences so that programs can learn from one another. Such actions will be essential to sustain and build on the lessons of the Subtitle D programs.

Exhibit 6.1

LESSONS LEARNED: RECRUITING AND MOBILIZING DIVERSE PARTICIPANTS

- ✓ To successfully recruit and enroll a diverse corps of participants, programs found it useful to define target groups in terms of priority, set numerical goals for each target group, monitor the results of recruitment and selection efforts against these goals, and modify recruitment efforts as necessary.
- ✓ Programs have found that peer recruitment is an effective method of recruiting participants from selected target groups. Programs should be encouraged to organize recruitment events that make use of participants and to provide them with the necessary training and logistical support.
- ✓ Another effective method of targeted recruitment is to ask public agencies and community organizations to refer applicants to the program. National service programs should be encouraged to ask potential service partners to refer likely participants.
- ✓ Not every program can achieve diversity on a broad range of characteristics. Different program designs limit diversity on certain characteristics, such as race/ethnicity, age, or education. The Corporation should take these limitations into account when awarding program grants, and decide explicitly whether to accept or reject designs that may limit participant diversity.
- ✓ New programs need to be particularly careful in efforts to achieve their diversity goals because programs tend to replicate the level of diversity they achieve in their first enrollment cycles. It is particularly important to set and monitor diversity targets from the beginning.
- ✓ Programs that enroll annually should consider having at least two annual enrollment periods. This provides an opportunity to replace participants who leave the program before completing their terms and to adjust recruitment strategy to achieve enrollment goals.
- ✓ In developing recruitment materials, programs should consider appealing primarily to the ethic of service rather than to more tangible benefits such as in-service stipends or post-service benefits.

Exhibit 6.2
LESSONS LEARNED: EDUCATION AND TRAINING

- ✓ The programs commit substantial resources to education and training activities. Their efforts focus on teaching civic responsibility, acceptance of diversity, and practical skills in planning and implementing community service projects. In general, the programs are still working to develop effective procedures for providing GED preparation.
- ✓ Offering initial orientation and training on a residential basis has been a useful method for programs to begin teaching the values of community service and civic responsibility, convey their own specific missions and policies, and build a sense of teamwork and shared purpose.
- ✓ A period of three to four months is usually needed to plan and organize initial training sessions.
- ✓ To ease the burden on participants, programs should provide assistance to help participants with particular needs.
- ✓ For some types of service projects, participants need specific knowledge and skills in order to be effective. Programs need to recognize this and provide the necessary training either directly or in conjunction with sponsoring organizations.
- ✓ Developing diverse learning opportunities appropriate for participants of widely varying ages, educational levels and life experiences has proven difficult. The Corporation can play an important technical assistance role by compiling and distributing information on best practices.
- ✓ To avoid misunderstandings with sponsoring organizations, programs need to be very explicit about the priority they attach to education and training activities, the cooperation needed from the sponsoring organization, and the amount of time participants will be taken away from direct service.
- ✓ The most valued service learning opportunities have come when participants can use their practical experience in community service to plan and manage service projects. Programs should provide these opportunities on a systematic basis for all participants.
- ✓ To develop and implement effective field-based service learning activities that teach policy and substantive lessons, programs should set educational objectives at the start of long-term service projects, and design exercises and assignments in which participants draw upon their service experiences.

Exhibit 6.3

LESSONS LEARNED: PROVIDING SERVICE TO MEET COMMUNITY NEEDS

- ✓ Most of the service projects undertaken by the Subtitle D programs are substantial in scope and duration. They address a broad range of community needs and involve partnerships with a variety of public agencies community organizations, and private sponsors.
- ✓ Collaboration between programs and sponsoring organizations is important in ensuring that needed services are provided to the community and that participants have a positive, learning experience. Programs should approach sponsoring organizations as "service partners" rather than simply as "host sites."
- ✓ Effective service partnerships require partner agencies that are committed to the goals of national service programs and prepared to invest the necessary resources, time, and staff commitment to achieve these goals. The most common reason why projects and partnerships fail is that the partner agencies are unable to deliver the required material resources, planning help, supervision, or staff assistance.
- ✓ Programs should be encouraged to use the site recruitment and selection process to inform community organizations about the mission of the program, measure the commitment and capabilities of potential service partners, and develop the capacity of local agencies and organizations to identify and attack community needs. To further ensure the commitment of the partner agencies, programs should be encouraged to provide initial orientation and training sessions for service partners that are parallel in purpose to those provided participants.
- ✓ Service projects range from short-term (1-3 months) to long-term (8-12 months); most projects are substantial in scope and duration. Programs need to recognize that, while such projects offer an opportunity to provide an enhanced learning experience for participants, they also require a high level of involvement and commitment from the sponsoring organization.
- ✓ Education and human needs are the most common focus of service projects. To expand significantly beyond these kinds of projects, programs will have to become part of the long-term strategy of public agencies and community organizations that focus on other issues, such as public safety or the environment.
- ✓ Programs should be encouraged to set measurable objectives for service projects and monitor the progress of projects against these objectives. The objectives should include participant development and service quality.
- ✓ Programs should be encouraged to make their own adjustments based on what they learn from careful monitoring and evaluation of service projects.
- ✓ Programs should focus on the kinds of projects that most effectively exploit their specific resources.

Exhibit 6.4

LESSONS LEARNED: PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

- ✓ Resting operational responsibility for national service programs in state agencies provides infrastructure resources such as financial management, but also exposes programs to delays and loss of flexibility. As part of the grant negotiation process, the Corporation should ensure that state agencies have identified and addressed potential bureaucratic barriers to implementation.
- ✓ Bureaucratic obstacles can be lessened when grants are awarded to state agencies that are comparatively small and have missions closely aligned with the mission of the national service program.
- ✓ Resting operational responsibility in nonprofit organizations provides more flexibility and facilitates quick response to emerging issues, although it requires development or expansion of fiscal and other management systems.
- ✓ The Delta Service Corps also offers a distinctive model of multi-state administration and management. A true collaboration rather than a hierarchical structure with a central office and local branches or affiliates. The Corporation should not reject alternative and innovative organizational settings for national service programs.
- ✓ Private nonprofit organizations have substantial advantages over state agencies in raising funds from the private sector.
- ✓ The programs generally follow a geographically based organization.
- ✓ The team leader staff position is a critical one in nearly every program. Programs should clearly define the scope of responsibility and priorities for team leaders.
- ✓ To ensure that team leaders have authority, access to resources, and independence from sponsoring organizations, it is useful but not essential for them to be paid program staff.
- ✓ To ensure that team leaders have enough timely information about the progress of participants and service projects to identify and resolve problems, programs should ensure that team leaders spend significant amounts of time on site at sponsoring organizations.
- ✓ Programs should strive to provide a high level of staff training and support in order to develop and retain a capable and dedicated staff, committed to the mission of the program.

Exhibit A.1
SUMMARY OF PROGRAM MODELS

City Year-Boston

City Year is a youth service corps, with eligibility restricted to individuals between 17 and 23 years of age. All participants are full-time, and the basic term of service is nine months, beginning with a one-week residential orientation/training session in late August and culminating in a formal graduation ceremony in mid-June. The first group of participants supported by CNCS funding enrolled in September 1992.

The program is organized around 12-member teams, each supervised by a team leader who is a paid staff member. Teams typically undertake two to three short-term service projects, lasting from one day up to three weeks, and one primary, "flagship," service project that represents a sustained commitment to a single agency or organization.

In its fifth year of operation, City Year has come to focus on working with children as its major service emphasis. This year, it has placed teams in middle schools, Head Start centers, and after-school programs, as well as expanding its involvement with elementary schools.

Diversity is a major theme of the City Year model, bringing together teams of young people who differ in gender, race/ethnicity, educational achievement, and experience. The success of the program in achieving diversity in its teams is cited by many host sites as an important reason for bringing in City Year teams. Recognizing the importance of word of mouth and example in attracting applicants, City Year teams make presentations to a variety of schools and youth organizations during the recruitment season.

The program puts a strong emphasis on participant development, and opportunities are provided for participants to develop their own projects and take on additional program responsibilities. Service activities occur Monday-Thursday, with Fridays set aside for education, leadership development, and service learning. The daily schedule for most teams begins with corps-wide calisthenics, team-building exercises, and general announcements. Allowing for these activities, two week-long training sessions (initial orientation and mid-year retreat), and a variety of team-building exercises and service project planning and development tasks, we estimate that about one-half of a "service year" is spent in participant development activities.

City Year also organizes a one-day Serve-a-Thon each year, reaching out to private firms, community organizations, and individual citizens throughout the Boston metropolitan area to recruit volunteers for a day of community service in various locations throughout the city.

Delta Service Corps

The Delta Service Corps is a regional program placing individual participants in public agencies and community organizations throughout the lower Mississippi River Delta in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Delta Service Corps follows an organizational model borrowed from the National Guard. Regional headquarters is in Little Rock, in the Division of Volunteerism, but substantial autonomy is provided to each state program. The regional office is responsible for coordinating training, setting priorities, maintaining standards, and overall coordination. Decisions are made by consensus, with frequent teleconferences and meetings among the three state programs and the regional headquarters. State directors are responsible for day-to-day management of their own programs.

Prepared by Abt Associates Inc.

Each state program is located in a different administrative setting: the Arkansas program is administered through two non-profit community organizations, the Mississippi program is based in the state Department of Education, and the Louisiana program is based in the lieutenant governor's office. Administrative setting makes a significant difference in the ability of state directors to mobilize resources, hire staff, and undertake innovations.

The Delta Service Corps is a true multi-generational program, with participants ranging in age from 17 to 82. The program includes a substantial number of senior participants; 20 percent of the program's participants are older than 60. The program also encourages virtually all participants to enroll for a second year. The first class of participants was enrolled in November 1992.

Participants are organized into dispersed teams and supervised by team leaders. Team leaders are full-time participants rather than paid staff, although they do receive a small additional stipend to compensate them for their added responsibilities and added travel. Depending on the distance separating participants, team meetings are held weekly, biweekly, or monthly. On average, five hours per week are set aside for team meetings and participant development activities.

Service projects cover a broad range of activities and vary considerably in duration. Many participants are recruited through referral from the public agencies and community organizations in which they will be placed. This assures that participants are fully integrated into the work of the host sites.

Participants from all three states are brought together for a week of residential orientation and training at the beginning of their enrollment, and again for four days of mid-year training. These sessions help to establish and maintain an identification with the regional Delta Service Corps rather than just with state programs, and participants establish relationships based on common interests and concerns that form the basis for a network of continued contacts across state lines.

Pennsylvania Service Corps

The Pennsylvania Service Corps intends to build a cadre of community service leaders by combining service experience and continuing education. Participants are placed individually at colleges and universities, public high schools, nonprofit agencies, and local government agencies throughout the state, with a concentration in the areas around Philadelphia, Harrisburg, and Pittsburgh. The program is administered by the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities in Harrisburg. The corps' headquarters is in Harrisburg, with small regional offices in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

The Pennsylvania Service Corps is an intergenerational program. Although it has both young and old participants, most (82 percent) are between the ages of 21 and 40. Participants may be full-time or part-time, and the term of service for full-time participants is 12 months. The first class of participants was enrolled in March 1993.

After enrollment and prior to placement at service sites, participants are brought together for one week of residential orientation and training. They are also brought together again for a three-day mid-year training session and a final five-day training session just prior to graduation. In addition, the program also offers ongoing education and training through its "University In Dispersion," intensive, two-day residential sessions held at one of the regional centers every month.

Participants undertake a variety of service projects. Corpsmembers placed at community-based organizations and K-12 schools typically work to expand the services offered by these agencies by

designing and implementing original programs. Corpsmembers placed in colleges and universities typically coordinate volunteer programs and help needy agencies find volunteers. All corpsmembers are expected to work toward designing programs that ultimately become self-sufficient at the end of the placement period. Participants work closely with staff field coordinators and their host site supervisors.

New Jersey Urban Schools Service Corps

The program builds on the Comer school reform underway in New Jersey by placing corps in 12 schools throughout the state that have adopted these reforms already. The mission is to make schools into community schools by involving parents and other community members and by providing additional services in the schools. The first group of participants enrolled in September 1993.

All school-based teams have created extended-day programs. Most have developed tutoring and mentoring programs. Many of the programs provide extracurricular activities, such as recreational clubs and reading programs. Participants are also involved in connecting schoolchildren and their parents with community agencies and social service programs. Corpsmembers assist with GED and ESL classes, and conduct parenting workshops and activities for parents and children.

The USSC currently operates out of the state Department of Higher Education, though the program will be based in a different administrative setting next year because of reorganization of the Department of Higher Education. The program depends upon a high level of cooperation at the school district and school building levels, including quite a bit of in-kind support.

Each school-based team may have up to ten full-time and up to ten part-time members. The program enrolled 112 full-time and 43 part-time participants in the 1993-94 school year, its first full year of operations. The large majority come from the community in which they are placed. Participants are supervised by a site coordinator (one per school) who was hired by the local School Planning and Management Team (a key element of the Comer School model).

The program holds residential orientation and training session separately for site coordinators (three days) and participants (five days) prior to the beginning of each school year. Each month, site coordinators and participants are also brought together for a full day of in-service training, as well as short-term special training sessions in specific topics as needed.

Georgia Peach Corps

The Georgia Peach Corps is a rural, intergenerational corps program operating in MacDuffie County and Toombs County, Georgia. The program's most distinctive feature is community development tied to community service. The Peach Corps planned to test a "saturation model" of community service by assessing whether communities of this size have enough people interested in serving, and enough appropriate community service projects, to sustain a large-scale corps program over time. A site coordinator, three crew chiefs and an education coordinator staff each site. Central coordination and administration is provided by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs, which also sponsors the All Star program. Policy is set at the state level, but the program is managed entirely at the local level. The first group of participants enrolled in January 1993.

Each site recruited 50 corpsmembers age 17 to 25 and 10 senior corpsmembers. With input from a local advisory committee, the corps is helping each community implement the All Star Community Improvement Program, a community-based needs assessment and planning program. The All Star Advisory Committee and a smaller All Star / Peach Corps Steering Committee identify service needs,

potential projects, and available resources.

Corpsmembers work in crews of 20 under the supervision of a crew chief; each team rotates through four-month assignments in three service areas. The human services rotation included projects such as planning recreational activities in nursing homes, working with mentally retarded adults, and delivering meals to home-bound elders. During the education rotation, corpsmembers served as class room aides in elementary and junior high schools. During the public works rotation, projects included renovating an abandoned school for use by the Toombs County Board of Education, repairing the roof at a MacDuffie County JTPA facility, and cleaning an historic cemetery.

Four days per week are spent on direct service, and the fifth day is devoted to training and in-service education, leadership development, career preparation, and life and civic skills. MacDuffie County devotes all day Friday to education activities; in Toombs County, each crew spends one half-day per week doing crew-specific education activities and the entire corps assembles for a community meeting on Friday afternoon.

Volunteer Maryland

Volunteer Maryland represents a volunteer-multiplier model. Participants are placed in nonprofit organizations and public agencies throughout the state to serve as volunteer coordinators. Their primary responsibility is to develop the capacity of the host organization to mobilize volunteers effectively. Their tasks include recruiting volunteers, training staff to work with volunteers, and developing volunteer tracking systems.

The program is intergenerational, with most participants between the ages of 21 and 50. The program specifically aims for diversity based on geography, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and education/work experience. However, because the program model has to do with building organizational capacity for effective volunteer management rather than providing direct service, it tends to select participants with comparatively high education levels; more than 60 percent of participants have at least a bachelor's degree. Participants serve full-time or part-time for 11 months. The goal of the program is to assign at least one full-time and one part-time participant to each host site. The first class of participants was enrolled in January 1993.

Full-time participants attend an intensive three-week training session on volunteer management and community service at the beginning of their enrollment period, immediately prior to being placed at their service sites. Subsequent training sessions bring all participants together once every two to four weeks.

Public AlliesxChicago

Public Allies is based in Washington, D.C.; the Chicago program is the organization's first expansion site. The program is a youth corps, and eligibility is restricted to individuals between the ages of 18 and 30. Within this age range, the program aims to select a diverse group of participants. All participants are full-time and serve for one year. The first group of participants was enrolled in September 1993.

Participants are placed individually in public agencies and community organizations, focusing on housing, health care, and youth development. Participants are organized into dispersed teams of ten members, each supervised by a team leader. Team leaders are paid staff. Each team concentrates on a single issue area. Participants, team leaders, and host site supervisors jointly plan specific service projects. Each team also plans and implements a "signature" project each year.

Prepared by Abt Associates Inc.

The program places an emphasis on leadership development. Participants are brought together for one week of residential orientation and training, and every Friday is set aside for additional training, education, and service learning. Training sessions tend to be devoted to a single primary topic, with topics selected to provide both knowledge and skills.

Kansas Health and Safety Extension Corps

The Kansas Health and Safety Extension Corps places teams of two full-time participants in Kansas State University Extension Offices around the state of Kansas. The program is intended to alleviate critical shortages of trained emergency response care in rural communities. Participants work closely with a county extension agent and a local planning committee assembled by the participants themselves to assess the emergency care needs of county residents and plan specific service projects. All participants receive training to become certified CPR and First Aid instructors.

Participants expand the capacities of each community by designing and implementing original programs. They also coordinate volunteer programs and help needy agencies find volunteers. The program expands the capacity of the Emergency Medical Service (EMS) training facilities to meet unmet demands for training of EMS volunteers.

The first group of participants was enrolled in March 1994.

City Volunteer Corps (CVC)

CVC is a large urban youth corps program based in New York City. The basic youth corps programs services about 700 participants per year. funding comes primarily from New York city government. Participants work in teams of 16-18 corpsmembers under the direction of a team leader. Teams are assigned to a series of projects, both physical and human services. Overall, the programs completes about 400 service projects per year.

The Subtitle D program is intended to be an enhanced version of the basic program. Emphasizing leadership development, the program provides participants with skills and experience in working with community organizations and public agencies to identify critical community needs in targeted neighborhoods, plan and implement service projects to address those needs, and measure performance on an ongoing basis to achieve maximum impact.

Participants are recruited from throughout the New York metropolitan area and begin their service with a week-long residential orientation. Participants work in teams of 10-12 members, supervised by a team leader, and assigned to specific neighborhoods.

Exhibit A.2

NATIONAL SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Sites		City Year		Delta		New Jersey		Pennsylvania		Georgia		Volunteer Maryland		Public Allies		Kansas		CVC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	1202	100.0	300	100.0	354	100.0	162	100.0	94	100.0	98	100.0	93	100.0	29	100.0	10	100.0	62	100.0
AGE																				
16-20	291	25.9	192	67.4	29	9.0	19	12.0	6	6.9	22	25.0	1	1.1	1	3.7	0	0.0	21	33.9
21-25	365	32.4	93	32.6	44	17.1	53	33.5	40	46.0	43	48.9	20	23.0	18	66.7	4	40.0	39	62.9
26-30	126	11.2	0	0.0	45	14.0	24	15.2	18	20.7	10	11.4	18	20.7	7	25.9	2	20.0	2	3.2
31-40	132	11.7	0	0.0	57	17.8	40	25.3	13	14.9	0	0.0	20	23.0	1	3.7	1	10.0	0	0.0
41-50	88	7.8	0	0.0	50	15.6	13	8.2	6	6.9	0	0.0	17	19.5	0	0.0	2	20.0	0	0.0
51-60	36	3.2	0	0.0	19	5.9	5	3.2	3	3.4	0	0.0	8	9.2	0	0.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
>60	87	7.7	0	0.0	66	20.6	4	2.5	1	1.1	13	14.8	3	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
RACE																				
White (not Hispanic)	498	42.1	135	45.2	135	38.8	22	13.7	64	69.6	39	41.5	73	79.3	10	35.7	10	100.0	10	16.7
African American	554	46.8	99	33.1	209	60.1	118	73.3	23	25.0	40	53.2	16	17.4	14	50.0	0	0.0	25	41.7
Hispanic/Latino	87	7.3	34	11.4	2	0.6	17	10.6	1	1.1	5	5.3	2	2.2	3	10.7	0	0.0	23	38.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	33	2.8	25	8.4	1	0.3	2	1.2	2	2.2	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	1.7
Other	12	1.0	6	2.0	1	0.3	2	1.2	2	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7
GENDER																				
Male	453	37.8	155	51.7	94	26.8	54	33.3	39	41.5	35	36.1	27	29.0	14	48.3	1	10.0	34	54.8
Female	745	62.2	145	48.3	257	73.2	108	66.7	55	58.5	62	63.9	66	71.0	15	51.7	9	90.0	28	45.2
PARTICIPATION STATUS																				
Full time	960	80.3	298	99.3	199	57.0	115	71.0	94	100.0	95	96.9	58	63.0	29	100.0	10	100.0	62	100.0
Part time	236	19.7	2	0.7	150	43.0	47	29.0	0	0.0	3	3.1	34	37.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PRIOR VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE																				
Yes	621	51.6	128	42.7	216	61.0	79	48.8	69	73.4	21	21.4	63	67.7	25	86.2	7	70.0	13	20.6
No	582	48.4	172	57.3	138	39.0	83	51.2	25	26.6	77	78.6	30	32.3	4	13.8	3	30.0	50	79.4
PRIOR VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE WITH:																				
1 program	356	57.3	87	68.0	120	55.6	45	57.0	30	43.5	19	90.5	27	42.9	16	64.0	3	42.9	9	69.2

Source: Participant Enrollment Forms received through July 30, 1994.

The participant characteristics shown here and in Exhibit A.3 below are based on EIS forms received through July 30, 1994. EIS enrollment forms are due the 20th of the month following the participant's enrollment. Therefore, these data reflect participants enrolled over the period July 1, 1993, when EIS reporting began, through June 30, 1994. The EIS enrollment forms thus potentially capture both first year and second year participants. The extent to which these figures represent Year 1, Year 2, or some combination varies by program. Specifically:

- ☐ Georgia includes only Year 1 participants; the second cohort did not enroll until July 1994.
- ☐ Pennsylvania, Delta, and Maryland includes both Year 1 and Year 2 participants.
- ☐ City Year includes Year 2 participants only; the Year 1 cohort had all terminated by July 1, 1993.
- ☐ NJ, Public Allies, Kansas, and CVC includes Year 2 participants only (recognizing that Year 2 is the first year of Subtitle D operations for these four programs).

Exhibit A.2 (cont.)

NATIONAL SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Sites		City Year		Delta		New Jersey		Pennsyl- vania		Georgia		Volunteer Maryland		Public Allies		Kansas		CVC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2 programs	130	20.9	21	16.4	48	22.2	16	20.3	14	20.3	2	9.5	21	33.3	3	12.0	3	42.9	2	15.4
3 programs	84	13.5	15	11.7	26	12.0	11	13.9	15	21.7	0	0.0	11	17.5	4	16.0	1	14.3	1	7.7
More than 3 programs	51	8.2	5	3.9	22	10.2	7	8.9	10	14.5	0	0.0	4	6.3	2	8.0	0	0.0	1	7.7
HOUSEHOLD SIZE																				
1 person	137	11.6	11	3.7	59	16.9	12	7.5	15	16.9	10	10.9	16	17.4	8	28.6	5	55.6	1	1.6
2 persons	233	19.8	31	10.5	82	23.5	35	21.7	29	32.6	13	14.1	24	26.1	5	17.9	0	0.0	14	23.0
3 persons	262	22.3	63	21.3	83	23.8	29	18.0	18	20.2	26	28.3	23	25.0	3	10.7	2	22.2	15	24.6
4 persons	232	19.7	72	24.3	52	14.9	34	21.1	16	18.0	28	30.4	12	13.0	4	14.3	0	0.0	14	23.0
5 persons	176	15.0	63	21.3	44	12.6	29	18.0	6	6.7	8	8.7	13	14.1	5	17.9	2	22.2	6	9.8
More than 5 persons	137	11.6	56	18.9	29	8.3	22	13.7	5	5.6	7	7.6	4	4.3	3	10.7	0	0.0	11	18.0
LIVING WITH PARENTS OR GUARDIANS																				
Yes	568	50.6																		
No	555	49.4	262	87.3	103	29.1	70	45.2	47	50.0	58	59.2	20	24.1	8	27.6	0	0.0		ERR
			38	12.7	251	70.9	85	54.8	47	50.0	40	40.8	63	75.9	21	72.4	10	100.0		ERR
PARTICIPANT HAS CHILD OR CHILDREN																				
Yes	437	37.1	24	8.1	218	63.7	72	44.7	16	17.2	45	47.4	38	40.9	10	35.7	5	50.0	9	14.8
No	741	62.9	271	91.9	124	36.3	89	55.3	77	82.8	50	52.6	55	59.1	18	64.3	5	50.0	52	85.2
PARTICIPANTS' NUMBER OF CHILDREN																				
1 child	127	31.4	18	75.0	51	24.6	19	28.4	5	33.3	19	43.2	9	28.1	4	40.0	2	40.0		ERR
2 or more children	277	68.6	6	25.0	156	75.4	48	71.6	10	66.7	25	56.8	23	71.9	6	60.0	3	60.0		ERR
CHILDREN LIVE WITH PARTICIPANT																				
Yes	344	79.4	18	75.0	170	78.7	65	90.3	13	81.3	32	72.7	27	73.0	9	90.0	4	80.0	6	66.7
No	89	20.6	6	25.0	46	21.3	7	9.7	3	18.8	12	27.3	10	27.0	1	10.0	1	20.0	3	33.3
MARITAL STATUS																				
Marriage-like situation	77	6.5	14	4.7	13	3.7	13	8.1	10	10.8	10	10.3	8	8.7	4	13.8	0	0.0	5	8.3
Married, live w/ spouse	211	17.8	3	1.0	116	33.2	25	15.5	14	15.1	16	16.5	31	33.7	2	6.9	4	40.0	0	0.0
Married, live w/o spouse	48	4.0	0	0.0	19	5.4	11	6.8	5	5.4	5	5.2	6	6.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.3
Widowed/divorced	108	9.1	0	0.0	75	21.5	11	6.8	1	1.1	10	10.3	9	9.8	0	0.0	1	10.0	1	1.7

Exhibit A.2 (cont.)

NATIONAL SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Sites		City Year		Delta		New Jersey		Pennsyl- vania		Georgia		Volunteer Maryland		Public Allies		Kansas		CVC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single, never married	744	62.6	280	94.3	126	36.1	101	62.7	63	67.7	56	57.7	38	41.3	23	79.3	5	50.0	52	86.7
PREVIOUSLY EMPLOYED																				
Yes	593	50.3	150	50.8	154	44.9	84	52.2	59	63.4	39	41.1	69	74.2	17	63.0	5	50.0	16	26.2
No	585	49.7	145	49.2	189	55.1	77	47.8	34	36.6	56	58.9	24	25.8	10	37.0	5	50.0	45	73.8
HOURS PER WEEK EMPLOYED																				
More than 0, less than 30	230	38.3	65	45.8	64	43.8	26	37.7	23	43.4	12	34.3	19	27.5	6	33.3	3	60.0	12	19.0
30 or more hours	370	61.7	77	54.2	82	56.2	43	62.3	30	56.6	23	65.7	50	72.5	12	66.7	2	40.0	51	81.0
HOUSEHOLD INCOME																				
\$0-\$5,000	247	26.5	37	22.4	88	27.2	43	31.4	17	26.6	24	27.9	13	18.1	9	39.1	1	10.0	15	30.0
\$5,001-\$10,000	193	20.7	27	16.4	75	23.1	30	21.9	16	25.0	22	25.6	6	8.3	2	8.7	4	40.0	11	22.0
\$10,001-\$15,000	126	13.5	23	13.9	55	17.0	15	10.9	3	4.7	108	11.6	9	12.5	4	17.4	2	20.0	5	10.0
\$15,001-\$20,000	98	10.5	19	11.5	36	11.1	10	7.3	8	12.5	5	9.3	10	13.9	2	8.7	0	0.0	5	10.0
\$20,001-\$25,000	65	7.0	11	6.7	22	6.8	11	8.0	4	6.3	11	5.8	6	8.3	3	13.0	0	0.0	3	6.0
\$25,001-\$35,000	102	11.0	22	13.3	26	8.0	17	12.4	9	14.1	6	12.8	12	16.7	2	8.7	0	0.0	3	6.0
\$35,001-\$50,000	100	10.7	26	15.8	22	6.8	11	8.0	7	10.9		7.0	16	22.2	1	4.3	3	30.0	8	16.0
RECEIVING AFDC																				
Yes	115	9.6	32	10.7	34	9.6	20	12.3	5	5.3	13	13.3	3	3.2	5	17.2	0	0.0	3	4.8
No	1088	90.4	268	89.3	320	90.4	142	87.7	89	94.7	85	86.7	90	96.8	24	82.8	10	100.0	60	95.2
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS																				
Yes	228	19.1	38	12.7	81	22.9	25	3.9	8	8.5	17	17.3	6	6.5	5	17.2	1	10.0	42	66.7
No	968	80.9	262	87.3	273	77.1	130	96.1	86	91.5	81	82.7	87	93.5	24	82.8	9	90.0	21	33.3
RECEIVING SOME FORM OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE																				
Yes	325	27.0	86	28.7	102	28.8	38	23.5	20	21.3	27	27.6	6	6.5	6	20.7	1	10.0	39	61.9
No	878	73.0	214	71.3	252	71.2	124	76.5	74	78.7	71	72.4	87	93.5	23	79.3	9	90.0	24	38.1
PRIMARY LANGUAGE																				
English	1099	92.3	253	84.6	347	99.1	38	23.5	20	21.3	94	95.9	90	96.8	27	93.1	10	100.0	49	77.8
Spanish	46	3.9	17	5.7	2	0.6	124	76.5	74	78.7	3	3.1	2	2.2	1	3.4	0	0.0	10	15.9
Other	46	3.9	29	9.7	1	0.3					1	1.0	1	1.1	1	3.4	0	0.0	4	6.3

Exhibit A.2 (cont.)

NATIONAL SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Sites		City Year		Delta		New Jersey		Pennsyl- vania		Georgia		Volunteer Maryland		Public Allies		Kansas		CVC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED																				
8th grade or less	20	1.7	5	1.7	9	2.6	137	88.4	92	97.9	6	6.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
9th, 10th or 11th grade	105	8.8	51	17.2	15	4.3	11	7.1	0	0.0	15	15.5	2	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	19.0
GED-12th grade	110	9.2	22	7.4	28	8.1	7	4.5	2	2.1	21	21.6	4	4.3	3	10.3	0	0.0	14	22.2
12th grade-high school	534	44.9	188	63.3	144	41.6					49	50.5	17	18.3	11	37.9	3	30.0	31	49.2
Assoc. or other degree	132	11.1	6	2.0	58	16.8					4	4.1	16	17.2	1	3.4	1	10.0	2	3.2
Bachelors degree	243	20.4	25	8.4	70	20.2					1	1.0	40	43.0	12	41.4	6	60.0	4	6.3
Masters degree	39	3.3	0	0.0	22	6.4					1	1.0	9	9.7	1	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Doctorate degree	7	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0					0	0.0	5	5.4	1	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
AGE OF PARTICIPANTS WITH CHILDREN																				
16-20	27	6.7	11	45.8	3	1.5	1	1.5	1	7.1	8	18.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	33.3
21-25	68	17.0	13	54.2	15	7.5	6	9.0	2	14.3	18	41.9	0	0.0	6	66.7	2	40.0	6	66.7
26-30	49	12.2	0	0.0	26	13.1	9	13.4	2	14.3	6	14.0	2	6.5	3	33.3	1	20.0	0	0.0
31-40	93	23.2	0	0.0	48	24.1	34	50.7	2	14.3	0	0.0	9	29.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
41-50	70	17.5	0	0.0	42	21.1	11	16.4	5	35.7	0	0.0	11	35.5	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
51-60	25	6.2	0	0.0	12	6.0	3	4.5	2	14.3	0	0.0	7	22.6	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
>60	69	17.2	0	0.0	53	26.6	3	4.5	0	0.0	11	25.5	2	6.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
MARITAL STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS WITH CHILDREN																				
CHILDREN	36	8.3	7	29.2	7	3.2	9	12.5	2	13.3	7	15.6	0	0.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	2	22.2
Marriage-like situation	167	38.6	1	4.2	96	44.4	23	31.9	5	33.3	13	28.9	23	62.2	2	20.0	4	80.0	0	0.0
Married, live w/spouse	40	9.2	0	0.0	15	6.9	11	15.3	4	26.7	5	11.1	5	13.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Married, live w/o spouse	87	20.1	0	0.0	62	28.7	10	13.9	0	0.0	7	15.6	6	16.2	0	0.0	1	20.0	1	11.1
Widowed/divorced	103	23.8	16	66.7	36	16.7	19	26.4	4	26.7	13	28.9	3	8.1	6	60.0	0	0.0	6	66.7
Single, never married																				
AGE OF PARTICIPANTS PREVIOUSLY EMPLOYED																				
16-20	138	25.2	98	67.6	4	2.8	13	17.1	4	7.3	11	33.3	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	43.8
21-25	189	34.6	47	32.4	36	25.4	27	35.5	26	57.3	16	48.5	17	28.3	10	66.7	1	20.0	9	56.3
26-30	80	14.6	0	0.0	26	18.3	14	18.4	15	27.3	5	15.2	15	25.0	4	26.7	1	20.0	0	0.0
31-40	63	11.5	0	0.0	27	19.0	15	19.7	7	12.7	0	0.0	12	20.0	1	6.7	1	20.0	0	0.0
41-50	43	7.9	0	0.0	25	17.6	3	3.9	3	5.5	0	0.0	10	16.7	0	0.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
51-60	10	1.8	0	0.0	6	4.2	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Exhibit A.2 (cont.)

NATIONAL SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Sites		City Year		Delta		New Jersey		Pennsyl- vania		Georgia		Volunteer Maryland		Public Allies		Kansas		CVC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
>60	24	4.4	0	0.0	18	12.7	3	3.9	0	0.0	1	3.0	2	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
PARTICIPATION STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS PREVIOUSLY EMPLOYED																				
Full time	477	82.2	149	99.3	99	65.1	57	72.2	59	100.0	38	97.4	39	60.0	17	100.0	5	100.0	14	100.0
Part time	103	17.8	1	0.7	53	34.9	22	27.8	0	0.0	1	2.6	26	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF PARTICIPANTS RECEIVING SOME FORM OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE																				
\$0-\$5,000	113	45.2	17	32.7	51	54.3	16	48.5	4	26.7	11	42.3	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	8	47.1
\$5,001-\$10,000	73	29.2	13	25.0	24	25.5	11	33.3	7	46.7	9	34.6	1	16.7	2	33.3	1	100.0	5	29.4
\$10,001-\$15,000	27	10.8	7	13.5	9	9.6	3	9.1	2	13.3	3	11.5	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	2	11.8
\$15,001-\$20,000	14	5.6	5	9.6	6	6.4	1	3.0	1	6.7	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$20,001-\$25,000	8	3.2	2	3.8	2	2.1	2	6.1	0	0.0	1	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9
\$25,001-\$35,000	11	4.4	5	9.6	2	2.1	0	0.0	1	6.7	2	7.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
\$35,001-\$50,000	4	1.6	3	5.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9
DIFFICULTY W/ENGLISH W/PRIMARY LANGUAGE																				
English																				
Never	960	86.3	218	86.9	302	87.0	128	93.4	84	91.3	64	68.1	90	96.8	22	81.5	6	60.0		74.2
Seldom	89	8.0	19	7.6	31	8.9	5	3.6	5	5.4	16	17.0	3	3.2	3	11.1	3	30.0		6.5
Sometimes	58	5.2	12	4.8	14	4.0	4	2.9	2	2.2	13	13.8	0	0.0	2	7.4	1	10.0		16.1
Usually	6	0.5	2	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		3.2
Spanish																				
Never	15	41.7	7	41.2	1	50.0	5	45.5	0	-	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	ERR		-
Seldom	5	13.9	1	5.9	0	0.0	2	18.2	0	-	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	ERR		-
Sometimes	12	33.3	6	35.3	1	50.0	3	27.3	0	-	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	ERR		-
Usually	4	11.1	3	17.6	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	-	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	ERR		-
Other																				
Never	21	51.2	12	42.9	0	0.0	5	71.4	1	50.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	ERR		-
Seldom	3	7.3	1	3.6	1	100.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	ERR		-
Sometimes	13	31.7	11	39.3	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	ERR		-
Usually	4	9.8	4	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	ERR		-

Exhibit A.2 (cont.)

NATIONAL SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Sites		City Year		Delta		New Jersey		Pennsyl- vania		Georgia		Volunteer Maryland		Public Allies		Kansas		CVC	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
AGE OF FULL-TIME PARTICIPANTS																				
16-20	262	29.4	191	67.3	13	7.2	11	9.9	6	6.9	22	25.6	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	18	34.6
21-25	310	34.8	93	32.7	38	21.0	33	29.7	40	46.0	43	50.0	9	16.7	18	66.7	4	40.0	32	61.5
26-30	102	11.4	0	0.0	33	18.2	17	15.3	18	20.7	10	11.6	13	24.1	7	25.9	2	20.0	2	3.8
31-40	97	10.9	0	0.0	38	21.0	32	28.8	13	14.9	0	0.0	12	22.2	1	3.7	1	10.0	0	0.0
41-50	71	8.0	0	0.0	40	22.1	12	10.8	6	6.9	0	0.0	11	20.4	0	0.0	2	20.0	0	0.0
51-60	25	2.8	0	0.0	13	7.2	2	1.8	3	3.4	0	0.0	6	11.1	0	0.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
>60	25	2.8	0	0.0	6	3.3	4	3.6	1	1.1	11	12.8	3	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
AGE OF PART-TIME PARTICIPANTS																				
16-20	26	12.1	1	100.0	16	11.5	8	17.8	0	-	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	-	0	-	-	-
21-25	48	22.4	0	0.0	17	12.2	20	44.4	0	-	0	0.0	11	40.7	0	-	0	-	-	-
26-30	24	11.2	0	0.0	12	8.6	7	15.6	0	-	0	0.0	5	18.5	0	-	0	-	-	-
31-40	28	13.1	0	0.0	18	12.9	8	17.8	0	-	0	0.0	2	7.4	0	-	0	-	-	-
41-50	17	7.9	0	0.0	10	7.2	1	2.2	0	-	0	0.0	6	22.2	0	-	0	-	-	-
51-60	9	4.2	0	0.0	6	4.3	1	2.2	0	-	0	0.0	2	7.4	0	-	0	-	-	-
>60	62	29.0	0	0.0	60	43.2	0	0.0	0	-	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	-	0	-	-	-
REASON FOR JOINING																				
Help others/community service	730	61.2	171	58	257	73.3	114	73.8	51	54.4	32	33	53	65.4	16	55	5	50.0	23	37.2
Job/training/job skills	163	13.7	31	10	34	9.6	17	10.7	27	28.7	11	11	14	16.7	8	29	4	40.0	15	23.8
Educ. funding/financial	172	14.4	25	8	0	0.0	2	1.1	0	0.0	5	5	0	0.0	0	0	0	0.0	6	9.8
GED/remedial education	38	3.2	16	5	5	1.4	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	1	0	0.0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.4
Friends join/new friends	24	2.0	23	8	16	4.5	5	3.3	5	5.1	4	4	6	7.4	5	18	0	0.0	1	2.1
Referred/probation/other	67	5.6																		

Exhibit A.3

DELTA SERVICE CORPS PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS¹

Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Delta Sites	Arkansas	Louisiana	Mississippi
----------------	-----------------	----------	-----------	-------------

Exhibit A.3 (continued)
DELTA SERVICE CORPS PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Percent by characteristic within each program

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	354	100.0	144	100.0	114	100.0	96	100.0
AGE								
16-20	29	9.0	18	13.0	4	4.0	7	8.3
21-25	55	17.1	18	13.0	21	21.2	16	19.0
26-30	45	14.0	20	14.5	11	11.1	14	16.7
31-40	57	17.8	19	13.8	22	22.2	16	19.0
41-50	50	15.6	21	15.2	17	17.2	12	14.3
51-60	19	5.9	10	7.2	4	4.0	5	6.0
>60	66	20.6	32	23.2	20	20.2	14	16.7
RACE								
White (not Hispanic)	135	38.8	81	57.0	48	42.9	6	6.4
African American	209	60.1	60	42.3	62	55.4	87	92.6
Hispanic/Latino	2	0.6	1	0.7	1	0.9	0	0.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0
Other	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.1
GENDER								
Male	94	26.8	40	28.0	30	26.5	24	25.3
Female	257	73.2	103	72.0	83	73.5	71	74.7
PARTICIPATION STATUS								
Full time	199	57.0	75	52.4	66	59.5	58	61.1
Part time	150	43.0	68	47.6	45	40.5	37	38.9
PRIOR VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE								
Yes	216	61.0	76	52.8	83	72.8	66	59.5
No	138	39.0	68	47.2	31	27.2	45	40.5
PRIOR VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE WITH:								
1 program	120	55.6	44	57.9	43	51.8	33	57.9
2 programs	48	22.2	17	22.4	21	25.3	10	17.5
3 programs	26	12.0	8	10.5	10	12.0	8	14.0
More than 3 programs	22	10.2	7	9.2	9	10.8	6	10.5
HOUSEHOLD SIZE								
1 person	59	16.9	24	16.9	24	21.4	11	11.6
2 persons	82	23.5	37	26.1	32	28.6	13	13.7
3 persons	83	23.8	41	28.9	19	17.0	23	24.2
4 persons	52	14.9	17	12.0	11	9.8	24	25.3
5 persons	44	12.6	14	9.9	15	13.4	15	15.8
More than 5 persons	29	8.3	9	6.3	11	9.8	9	9.5
LIVING WITH PARENTS OR GUARDIANS								
Yes	103	29.1	45	31.3	22	19.3	36	37.5

Exhibit A.3 (continued)
DELTA SERVICE CORPS PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS
Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Delta Sites		Arkansas		Louisiana		Mississippi	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	251	70.9	99	68.8	92	80.7	60	62.5
PARTICIPANT HAS CHILD OR CHILDREN								
Yes	218	63.7	89	62.7	67	62.0	62	67.4
No	124	36.5	53	37.3	41	38.0	30	32.6
PARTICIPANTS' NUMBER OF CHILDREN								
1 child	51	24.6	23	27.4	14	21.5	14	24.1
2 or more children	156	75.4	61	72.6	51	78.5	44	75.9
CHILDREN LIVE WITH PARTICIPANT								
Yes	170	78.7	70	79.5	48	71.6	52	85.2
No	461	21.3	18	20.5	19	28.4	9	14.8
MARITAL STATUS								
Marriage-like situation	13	3.7	4	2.8	6	5.3	3	3.2
Married, live w/ spouse	116	33.2	50	35.2	38	33.6	28	29.8
Married, live w/o spouse	19	5.4	6	4.2	7	6.2	6	6.4
Widowed/divorced	75	21.5	39	27.5	22	19.5	14	14.9
Single, never married	126	36.1	43	30.3	40	35.4	43	45.7
PREVIOUSLY EMPLOYED								
Yes	154	44.9	56	40.3	51	45.1	47	51.6
No	189	55.1	83	59.7	62	54.9	44	48.4
HOURS PER WEEK EMPLOYED								
More than 0, less than 30	64	43.8	20	35.7	23	48.9	21	48.2
30 or more hours	82	56.2	36	64.3	24	51.1	22	51.2
HOUSEHOLD INCOME								
\$0-\$5,000	88	27.2	33	24.6	23	22.1	32	37.2
\$5,001-\$10,000	75	23.1	31	23.1	24	23.1	20	23.3
\$10,001-\$15,000	55	17.0	23	17.2	19	18.3	13	15.1
\$15,001-\$20,000	36	11.1	18	13.4	10	9.6	8	9.3
\$20,001-\$25,000	22	6.8	11	8.2	7	6.7	4	4.7
\$25,001-\$35,000	26	8.0	13	9.7	7	6.7	6	7.0
\$35,001-\$50,000	22	6.8	5	3.7	14	13.5	3	3.5
RECEIVING AFDC								
Yes	34	9.6	10	6.9	11	9.6	13	13.5
No	320	90.4	134	93.1	103	90.4	83	86.5
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS								
Yes	81	22.9	24	16.7	23	20.2	34	35.4
No	273	77.1	120	83.3	90	79.8	62	64.6

Exhibit A.3 (continued)
DELTA SERVICE CORPS PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS
Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Delta Sites		Arkansas		Louisiana		Mississippi	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
RECEIVING SOME FORM OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE								
Yes	102	28.8	32	22.2	27	23.7	43	44.8
No	252	71.2	112	77.8	87	76.3	53	55.2
PRIMARY LANGUAGE								
English	357	99.1	142	99.3	112	99.0	93	98.9
Spanish	2	0.6	1	0.7	1	0.9	0	0.0
Other	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.1
HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED								
8th grade or less	9	2.6	4	2.9	0	0.0	5	5.3
9th, 10th or 11th grade	15	4.3	11	7.9	1	0.9	3	3.2
GED-12th grade	28	8.1	11	7.9	6	5.4	11	11.6
12th grade-high school	144	41.6	66	47.5	40	35.7	38	40.0
Assoc. or other degree	58	16.8	20	14.4	25	22.3	13	13.7
Bachelors degree	70	20.2	20	14.4	34	30.4	16	16.8
Masters degree	22	6.4	7	5.0	6	5.4	9	9.5
Doctorate degree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
AGE OF PARTICIPANTS WITH CHILDREN								
16-20	3	1.5	1	1.2	0	0.0	2	3.7
21-25	15	7.5	6	7.1	4	6.6	5	9.3
26-30	26	13.1	13	15.5	5	8.2	8	14.8
31-40	48	24.1	16	19.0	18	29.5	14	25.9
41-50	42	21.1	16	19.0	14	23.0	12	22.2
51-60	12	6.0	7	8.3	2	3.3	3	5.6
>60	53	26.6	25	29.8	18	29.5	10	18.5
MARITAL STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS WITH CHILDREN								
Marriage-like situation	7	3.2	3	3.4	2	3.0	2	3.3
Married, live w/spouse	96	44.4	40	45.5	33	49.3	23	37.7
Married, live w/o spouse	15	6.9	3	3.4	6	9.0	6	9.8
Widowed/divorced	62	28.7	34	38.6	17	25.4	11	18.0
Single, never married	36	16.7	8	9.1	9	13.4	19	31.1
AGE OF PARTICIPANTS PREVIOUSLY EMPLOYED								
16-20	4	2.8	2	3.7	2	4.3	0	0.0
21-25	36	25.4	13	24.1	14	29.8	9	22.0
26-30	26	18.3	9	16.7	5	10.6	12	29.3
31-40	27	19.0	7	13.0	12	25.5	8	19.5
41-50	25	17.6	12	22.2	7	14.9	6	14.6
51-60	6	4.2	4	7.4	2	4.3	0	0.0
>60	18	12.7	7	13.0	5	10.6	6	14.6

Exhibit A.3 (continued)
DELTA SERVICE CORPS PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS
 Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Delta Sites		Arkansas		Louisiana		Mississippi	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PARTICIPATION STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS PREVIOUSLY EMPLOYED								
EMPLOYED		65.1	37	66.1	31	63.3	31	66.0
Full time	99	34.9	19	33.9	18	36.7	16	34.0
Part time	53							
HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF PARTICIPANTS RECEIVING SOME FORM OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE								
\$0-\$5,000	51	54.3	15	51.7	13	50.0	23	59.0
\$5,001-\$10,000	24	25.5	8	27.6	7	26.9	9	23.1
\$10,001-\$15,000	9	9.6	2	6.9	4	15.4	3	7.7
\$15,001-\$20,000	6	6.4	3	10.3	1	3.8	2	5.1
\$20,001-\$25,000	2	2.1	0	0.0	1	3.8	1	2.6
\$25,001-\$35,000	2	2.1	1	3.4	0	0.0	1	2.6
\$35,001-\$50,000	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
DIFFICULTY W/ENGLISH W/PRIMARY LANGUAGE								
English								
Never	302	87.0	123	86.6	104	92.9	75	80.6
Seldom	31	8.9	16	11.3	8	7.1	7	7.5
Sometimes	14	4.0	3	2.1	0	0.0	11	11.8
Usually	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Spanish								
Never	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	-
Seldom	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	-
Sometimes	1	50.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	-
Usually	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	-
Other								
Never	0	0.0	0	-	0	-	0	0.0
Seldom	1	100.0	0	-	0	-	1	100.0
Sometimes	0	0.0	0	-	0	-	0	0.0
Usually	0	0.0	0	-	0	-	0	0.0
AGE OF FULL-TIME PARTICIPANTS								
16-20	13	7.2	6	8.5	3	4.9	4	8.2
21-25	38	21.0	12	16.9	15	24.6	11	22.4
26-30	33	18.2	13	18.3	10	16.4	10	20.4
31-40	38	21.0	16	22.5	14	23.0	8	16.3
41-50	40	22.1	17	23.9	14	23.0	9	18.4
51-60	13	7.2	6	8.6	3	4.9	4	8.2
>60	6	3.3	1	1.4	2	3.3	3	6.1
AGE OF PART-TIME PARTICIPANTS								
16-20	16	11.5	12	17.9	1	2.7	3	8.6
21-25	17	12.2	6	9.0	6	16.2	5	14.3

Exhibit A.3 (continued)
DELTA SERVICE CORPS PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS
 Percent by characteristic within each program

CHARACTERISTIC	All Delta Sites		Arkansas		Louisiana		Mississippi	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
26-30	12	8.6	7	10.4	1	2.7	4	11.4
31-40	18	12.9	3	4.5	7	18.9	8	22.9
41-50	10	7.2	4	6.0	3	8.1	3	8.6
51-60	6	4.3	4	6.0	1	2.7	1	2.9
>60	60	43.2	31	46.3	18	48.6	11	31.4
REASON FOR JOINING								
Help others/community service	257	73.3	93	65	82	72.6	82	87
Job/training/job skills	34	9.6	18	12	12	10.5	4	4
Educ. funding/financial	40	11.3	25	18	10	9.1	4	4
GED/remedial education	0	0.0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
Friends join/new friends	5	1.4	3	2	0	0.0	2	2
Referred/probation/other	16	4.5	4	3	9	7.8	3	3

Exhibit A.4
DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUALS BY RACE/ETHNICITY
Programs Compared with Service Area

Program	White	African-American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander	Other
City Volunteer Corps	16.7%	41.7%	38.3%	1.7%	1.7%
New York City	43.2	25.2	24.4	6.7	0.5
City Year	45.2	33.1	11.4	8.4	2.0
Boston	86.1	5.6	4.9	3.0	0.4
Delta Service Corps, Arkansas	57.0	42.3	0.7	0.0	0.0
Arkansas	82.2	15.9	0.9	0.5	0.0
Delta Service Corps, Louisiana	42.9	55.4	0.9	0.9	0.0
Louisiana	65.8	30.6	2.2	0.9	0.5
Delta Service Corps, Mississippi	6.4	92.6	0.0	0.0	1.1
Mississippi	63.1	35.4	0.6	0.5	0.4
Georgia Peach Corps	41.5	53.2	5.3	0.0	0.0
Georgia	70.1	26.8	1.7	1.1	0.3
Kansas Health and Safety Corps	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kansas	88.4	5.7	3.8	1.2	0.9
New Jersey Urban School Service Corps	13.7	73.3	10.6	1.2	1.2
New Jersey	74.0	12.7	9.6	3.4	0.3

Source: Participant Enrollment Forms received through July 30, 1994 for programs; 1990 U.S. Census, United States Summary for service areas.

Pennsylvania Service Corps	69.6	25.0	1.1	2.2	2.2
Pennsylvania	87.7	9.0	2.0	1.1	0.2
Public Allies	35.7	50.0	10.7	3.6	0.0
Chicago	39.3	37.8	19.1	3.6	0.2
Volunteer Maryland	79.3	17.4	2.2	1.0	0.0
Maryland	69.6	24.6	2.6	2.9	0.3

Source: Participant Enrollment Forms received through July 30, 1994 for programs; 1990 U.S. Census, United States Summary for service areas.