



K-12 Service-Learning Standards for Quality Practice

SHELLY H. BILLIG
RMC Research Corporation
WOKIE WEAH
National Youth Leadership Council

Shelly H. Billig, Ph.D., is vice president of Denver's RMC Research Corporation; Senior K-12 Program Advisor for the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse; and Principal Investigator for service-learning, character education, civic engagement, and educational reform research and evaluation projects.

Wokie Weah, NYLC vice president, oversees professional development, HIV/AIDS prevention initiatives, and new service-learning program development. A past UNICEF Project Officer for Education, she has written and spoken on service-learning and diversity throughout the United States and Africa.

In *Growing to Greatness 2007*, we presented the history of the development of standards for service-learning and shared promising research-based practices to improve student outcomes. For decades, the echoes of “quality matters” were evident in many evaluations and research studies. Without fidelity to quality, service-learning does not live up to its promise of positive outcomes; but with quality, significant impacts on participants have been found in the areas of academic performance, civic engagement and responsibility, personal and social skills, career aspirations, reduction of risky behaviors, and more (Billig 2007; Weah 2007).

Over the years, quality has been defined in various ways, but only recently has the research base provided strong direction. In last year's volume, we presented the Principles of Effective Practice. With this volume of *Growing to Greatness*, we celebrate the collective work of many communities around the country in refining those original principles and translating them into the new K-12 Service-Learning Standards for Quality Practice.

The Process

The road to these standards and indicators began in 1989, with a Wingspread Conference on the principles of practice for combining service and learning. Subsequent significant efforts included the ASLER standards in 1993 (Alliance for Service-Learning Education Reform 1995) and the Essential Elements of Service-Learning in 1998 (National Service-Learning Cooperative 1999). With new research supporting the predictors of impact, new principles of effective practice were drafted last year (Billig 2007).

Service-Learning: A philosophy, pedagogy, and model for community development that is used as an instructional strategy to meet learning goals and/or content standards.

Since then, the research has been synthesized and extended, and experts convened to draft new standards and indicators based on research and professional judgments. These new standards and indicators then were vetted through a series of “reactor panels” made up of young people, teachers, school and district administrators, community members, staff from community-based organizations, policy-makers, and others interested in service-learning. These gatherings, all of which followed the same format, were held across the country — from Washington DC to Hawaii, from Maine and Minnesota to Florida. The heartland held the most reactor panels: two in Ohio, one in Michigan, one in Illinois, and one in Nebraska. In all, 21 panels took place from July to January. Participation ranged from as few as seven people to as many as 250 in each panel.

The reactor panels used the same standards-setting process that has been used in many states to develop content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. Each of these panels considered the edits of previous panels, revising the standards and indicators to ensure they included the strongest aspects of quality, and to make them clear, measurable, and actionable. The result of this convergence of research and practice was the development of standards and indicators of quality service-learning practice. In the end, the original eight principles of effective practice and the original 75 indicators became the following eight standards and 35 indicators. While the journey was long, the results were a set of crystallized ideas set forth in simple, attainable, and measurable forms.

Implications for Key Audiences

Practitioners

- Provides a common set of well-defined expectations for high quality practice.
- Prompts in-depth discussions of practice to help educators reflect on and improve their practice.
- Provides framework for outside evaluation of practice (e.g. the Certificate of Excellent Practice).
- Provides professional development guidelines for pre-service and in-service teachers and for professional development of community members and community-based organizations.
- Provides guidelines for monitoring progress and sustaining continuous improvement.
- Provides consistent language to use for discussing quality.

Researchers

- Provides guidance for operationalizing practices and testing constructs that serve as moderators or predictors of impact.
- Promotes the formation of a common research agenda for improving impacts.
- Helps researchers engage in hypothesis testing and asking additional questions about practice to promote understanding.
- Provides additional guidance for evaluations.

Policy-makers

- Provides guidance for policy creation at local and state levels.
- Provides criteria for evaluating funding proposals and programs — locally, and at the state and federal levels.
- Provides guidance for teacher licensure and recognition.
- Suggests consistent language for policy change and advocacy.

K-12 Standards and Indicators for Quality Service-Learning Practice			
Duration and Intensity	Link to Curriculum	Partnerships	Meaningful Service
Service-learning has sufficient duration and intensity to address community needs and meet specified outcomes.	Service-learning is intentionally used as an instructional strategy to meet learning goals and/or content standards.	Service-learning partnerships are collaborative, mutually beneficial, and address community needs.	Service-learning actively engages participants in meaningful and personally relevant service activities.
<p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service-learning experiences include the processes of investigating community needs, preparing for service, action, reflection, demonstration of learning and impacts, and celebration. 2. Service-learning is conducted during concentrated blocks of time across a period of several weeks or months. 3. Service-learning experiences provide enough time to address identified community needs and achieve learning outcomes. 	<p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service-learning has clearly articulated learning goals. 2. Service-learning is aligned with the academic and/or programmatic curriculum. 3. Service-learning helps participants learn how to transfer knowledge and skills from one setting to another. 4. Service-learning that takes place in schools is formally recognized in school board policies and student records. 	<p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service-learning involves a variety of partners, including youth, educators, families, community members, community-based organizations, and/or businesses. 2. Service-learning partnerships are characterized by frequent and regular communication to keep all partners well-informed about activities and progress. 3. Service-learning partners collaborate to establish a shared vision and set common goals to address community needs. 4. Service-learning partners collaboratively develop and implement action plans to meet specified goals. 5. Service-learning partners share knowledge and understanding of school and community assets and needs, and view each other as valued resources. 	<p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service-learning experiences are appropriate to participant ages and developmental abilities. 2. Service-learning addresses issues that are personally relevant to the participants. 3. Service-learning provides participants with interesting and engaging service activities. 4. Service-learning encourages participants to understand their service experiences in the context of the underlying societal issues being addressed. 5. Service-learning leads to attainable and visible outcomes that are valued by those being served.

K-12 Standards and Indicators for Quality Service-Learning Practice			
Youth Voice	Diversity	Reflection	Progress Monitoring
Service-learning provides youth with a strong voice in planning, implementing, and evaluating service-learning experiences with guidance from adults.	Service-learning promotes understanding of diversity and mutual respect among all participants.	Service-learning incorporates multiple challenging reflection activities that are ongoing and that prompt deep thinking and analysis about oneself and one's relationship to society.	Service-learning engages participants in an ongoing process to assess the quality of implementation and progress toward meeting specified goals, and uses results for improvement and sustainability.
<p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service-learning engages youth in generating ideas during the planning, implementation, and evaluation processes. 2. Service-learning involves youth in the decision-making process throughout the service-learning experiences. 3. Service-learning involves youth and adults in creating an environment that supports trust and open expression of ideas. 4. Service-learning promotes acquisition of knowledge and skills to enhance youth leadership and decision-making. 5. Service-learning involves youth in evaluating the quality and effectiveness of the service-learning experience. 	<p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service-learning helps participants identify and analyze different points of view to gain understanding of multiple perspectives. 2. Service-learning helps participants develop interpersonal skills in conflict resolution and group decision-making. 3. Service-learning helps participants actively seek to understand and value the diverse backgrounds and perspectives of those offering and receiving service. 4. Service-learning encourages participants to recognize and overcome stereotypes. 	<p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service-learning reflection includes a variety of verbal, written, artistic, and nonverbal activities to demonstrate understanding and changes in participants' knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes. 2. Service-learning reflection occurs before, during, and after the service experience. 3. Service-learning reflection prompts participants to think deeply about complex community problems and alternative solutions. 4. Service-learning reflection encourages participants to examine their preconceptions and assumptions in order to explore and understand their roles and responsibilities as citizens. 5. Service-learning reflection encourages participants to examine a variety of social and civic issues related to their service-learning experience so that participants understand connections to public policy and civic life. 	<p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Service-learning participants collect evidence of progress toward meeting specific service goals and learning outcomes from multiple sources throughout the service-learning experience. 2. Service-learning participants collect evidence of the quality of service-learning implementation from multiple sources throughout the service-learning experience. 3. Service-learning participants use evidence to improve service-learning experiences. 4. Service-learning participants communicate evidence of progress toward goals and outcomes with the broader community, including policy-makers and education leaders, to deepen service-learning understanding and ensure that high quality practices are sustained.

Next Steps

While the standards have been established, important dissemination, implementation, and research steps lie ahead. Some next steps include:

- Workshops on standards and indicators at the annual *National Service-Learning Conference*, and other professional conferences
- A set of white papers that summarize the research behind each of the standards
- New professional development offerings
- New self-assessment tools

In addition, researchers will need to test the standards and indicators as predictors of outcomes, and the variations that appear to work best — for whom and under what conditions. Young people, educators, community partners, policy-makers, and researchers all have vital roles in this next phase.

Conclusion

Practitioners have known that service-learning has the potential to be a strong catalyst for change. Increasingly, research confirms that high quality service-learning experiences strengthen people, schools, and communities (Billig 2004).

These standards are offered with the hope that they will prove to be a significant tool in achieving the larger goals of service-learning: educational improvement, community development, and social change.

The reference edition of the K-12 Service-Learning Standards for Quality Practice is available for free download at www.nylc.org/standards.

REFERENCES

- This bibliography contains studies and research summaries that were analyzed to help develop the original draft of the standards and indicators.*
- Abravanel, S.A. (2003). *Building Community through Service-Learning: The Role of the Community Partner*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Abt Associates and Brandeis University. (2003). *Study of the Community, Higher Education, and School Partnership (CHESP)*. Hadley, MA: Abt Associates and Brandeis University.
- Adey, P., Robertson, A., and Venville, G. (2002). Effects of a Cognitive Acceleration Programme on Year 1 Pupils. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72, 1-25.
- Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform. (1995). *Standards of Quality for School-Based and Community-Based Service-Learning*. Alexandria, VA: Alliance for Service-Learning in Education Reform.
- American Youth Policy Forum. (2002, April 19). The YouthBuild Welfare-to-Work Program: Its Outcomes and Policy Implications. Available at www.aypf.org/forumbriefs/2002/fb041902.htm.
- Ammon, M.S., Furco, A., Chi, B., and Middaugh, E. (2002). *Service-Learning in California: A Profile of the CalServe Service-Learning Partnerships (1997-2000)*. Berkeley: University of California, Service-Learning Research and Development Center.
- Andersen, S. (1998, September). *Service Learning: A National Strategy for Youth Development*. Washington, DC: George Washington University. Available at www.gwu.edu/~ccps/pop_svc.html.
- Bailis, L.N. (2000). *Taking Service-Learning to the Next Level: Emerging Lessons from the National Community Development Program*. Springfield, VA: National Society for Experiential Education.
- Bailis, L.N., and Melchior, A. (2004). Promoting and Sustaining Civic Partnerships: A Conceptual History, Framework, and a Call to Action. *Service-Learning Network*, 10(1), 1-8.
- Banks, J. (1994). *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Batenburg, M.P. (1995). *Community Agency and School Collaboration: Going In with Your Eyes Open*. Palo Alto, CA: Service Learning 2000 Center.
- Bernhardt, V. (1998). *Data Analysis for Comprehensive Schoolwide Improvement*. Larchmont NY: Eye on Education.
- Billig, S.H. (2000). Research on K-12 School-Based Service-Learning: The Evidence Builds. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(9), 658-664.
- Billig, S.H. (2002a). Adoption, Implementation, and Sustainability of K-12 Service-Learning. In A. Furco and S.H. Billig (Eds.), *Advances in Service-Learning Research: Vol. 1. Service-Learning: The Essence of the Pedagogy* (pp. 245-267). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Billig, S.H. (2002b). *W.K. Kellogg Foundation Retrospective of K-12 Service-Learning Projects, 1990-2000*. Denver, CO: RMC Research Corporation.
- Billig, S.H. (2004). Heads, Hearts, and Hands: The Research on K-12 Service-Learning. *Growing to Greatness 2004*. St. Paul, MN: National Youth Leadership Council.
- Billig, S.H., and Brodersen, R.M. (2007). *Case Studies of Effective Practices in the Partnership in Character Education Project: Evaluation for the School District of Philadelphia*. Denver, CO: RMC Research Corporation.
- Billig, S.H., Root, S., and Jesse, D. (2005). The Relationship between Quality Indicators of Service-Learning and Student Outcomes: Testing Professional Wisdom. In S. Root, J. Callahan, and S.H. Billig (Eds.), *Advances in Service-Learning Research: Vol. 5. Improving Service-Learning Practice: Research on Models to Enhance Impacts* (pp. 97-115). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Blyth, D., Saito, R., and Berkas, T. (1997). A Quantitative Study of the Impact of Service-Learning Programs. In A. Waterman (Ed.), *Service-Learning: Applications from the Research* (pp. 39-55). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Boykin, A.W. (1994). Harvesting Talent and Culture: African American Children and Educational Reform. In R. Rossi (Ed.), *Schools and Students at Risk: Context and Framework for Positive Change* (pp. 116-138). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bradley, L.R. (2003). Using Developmental and Learning Theory in the Design and Evaluation of K-16 Service-Learning Programs. In S.H. Billig and A.S. Waterman (Eds.), *Studying Service-Learning: Innovations in Education Research Methodology* (pp. 47-72). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bringle, R.G., and Hatcher, J.A. (1999, Summer). Reflection in Service-Learning: Making Meaning of Experience. *Educational Horizons*, 77, 179-185.
- Camino, L., and Zeldin, S. (2002). From Periphery to Center: Pathways for Youth Civic Engagement in the Day-to-Day Life of Communities. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 213-220.
- Catalano, R.F., Haggerty, K.P., Oesterle, S., Fleming, C.B., and Hawkins, J.D. (2004). The Importance of Bonding to School for Healthy Development: Findings from the Social Development Research Group. *Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 252-261.
- Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE). (2002). *Challenging Activities: Standard 4. Teaching Complex Thinking: Challenge Students toward Cognitive Complexity*. Berkeley: University of California. Available at http://crede.berkeley.edu/standards/4chal_act.shtml.
- Conrad, D., and Hedin, D. (1980). *Executive Summary of the Final Report of the Experiential Education Evaluation Project*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Center for Youth Development.
- Conrad, D., and Hedin, D. (1987). *Youth Service: A Guidebook for Developing and Operating Effective Programs*. Washington DC: Independent Sector.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *School and Society* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier Books.
- Dewsbury-White, K.E. (1993). *The Relationship of Service-Learning Project Models to the Subject-Matter Achievement of Middle School Students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.
- Do the Math: Cognitive Demand Makes a Difference. (2006, Fall). *Research Points*, 4(2), 1-4. Available at http://www.aera.net/uploadedFiles/Journals_and_Publications/Research_Points/RP_Fall06.pdf.
- Drake, S.M. and Burns, R.C. (2004). *Meeting Standards through Integrated Curriculum*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Eyler, J. and Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eyler, J., and Giles, D., (1997). The Importance of Program Quality in Service-Learning. In A. Waterman (Ed.), *Service-Learning: Applications from the Research* (pp. 57-76). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eyler, J., Giles, D., and Schmiede, A. (1996). *A Practitioner's Guide to Reflection in Service-Learning*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.
- Fredericks, L. (2002). *Learning that Lasts: How Service-Learning Can Become an Integral Part of Schools, States and Communities*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Fredericks, L., Kaplan, E., and Zeisler, J. (2001). *Integrating Youth Voice in Service-Learning*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Fuchs, L.S., & Fuchs, D. (2006). *What is Scientifically Based Research on Progress Monitoring?* Washington, DC: National Center on Student Progress Monitoring. Available at http://www.studentprogress.org/library/What_is_Scientificall_%20Based_Research.pdf.
- Furco, A. (2002). Is Service-Learning Really Better than Community Service? A Study of High School Service Program Outcomes. In A. Furco and S.H. Billig (Eds.), *Advances in Service-Learning Research: Vol. 1. Service-Learning: The Essence of the Pedagogy* (pp. 23-50). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Goldberg, J.S., and Cole, B.R. (2002, October). Quality Management in Education: Building Excellence and Equity in Student Performance. *Quality Management Journal*, 9(4), 8-22. Available at http://www.asq.org/pub/qmj/past/vol9_issue4/goldberg.html.
- Good, T., and Brophy, J. (2000). *Looking in Classrooms* (8th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Greene, D., and Diehm, G. (1995). Educational and Service Outcomes of a Service Integration Effort. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 54-62.
- Gregory, P., Steinbring, Y.J. and Sousa, C.M. (2003, April). Voluntary Community Involvement of Latinos: A Literature Review. Davis: University of California. Available at <http://ucce.ucdavis.edu/files/filelibrary/5433/8114.pdf>.
- Gulati-Partee, G., and Finger, W.R. (1996). *Critical Issues in K-12 Service Learning: Case Studies and Reflections*. Alexandria, VA: National Society for Experiential Education.

- Hamilton, S.F., and Zeldin, R.S. (1987, Winter). Learning Civics in the Community. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 17(4), 407-420.
- Hammond, L., and Heredia, S. (2002, Spring). Fostering Diversity through Community Service Learning. *Service-Learning Network*, 9(1), 2-5.
- Hobbs, B.B. (2001, August). Diversifying the Volunteer Base: Latinos and Volunteerism. *Journal of Extension*, 39(4), 1-7. Available at <http://www.joe.org/joe/2001august/a1.html>.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Peterson, A.R., and Allen, W.R. (1999). Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: Improving the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 26(8). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Jacobson, M., and Working Group 2 Collaborators. (n.d.). *Complex Systems and Education: Cognitive, Learning, and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Cambridge, MA: New England Complex Systems Institute. Available at http://necsi.org/events/cxedk16/cxedk16_2.html.
- Justinianno, J., and Scherer, C. (2001). *Youth Voice: A Guide for Engaging Youth in Leadership and Decision-Making in Service-Learning Programs*. Washington, DC: Points of Light Foundation.
- Keith, N.Z. (1997). Doing Service Projects in Urban Settings. In A.S. Waterman (Ed.), *Service-Learning: Applications from the Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kentucky Department of Education. (2003). Equitable Learning. Available at www.kde.state.ky.us/equitablelearning.
- Kessler, R. (2000). *The Soul of Education: Helping Students Find Connection, Compassion, and Character at School*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- KIDS Consortium. (2001). *KIDS as Planners: A Guide to Strengthening Students, Schools and Communities through Service-Learning*. Lewiston, ME: KIDS Consortium.
- Kohn, A. (1993, September). Choices for Children: Why and How to Let Students Decide. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75(1), 8-20. Available at www.alfiekohn.org/teaching/cfc.htm.
- Kraft, R., and Krug, J. (1994). Review of Research and Evaluation on Service-Learning in Public and Higher Education. In R. Kraft and M. Swadener (Eds.), *Building Community: Service Learning in the Academic Disciplines*. Denver, CO: Colorado Campus Compact.
- Kramer, M. (2000). *Make it Last Forever: The Institutionalization of Service Learning in America*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service.
- LaPointe, L. (2004, Spring). American Indian Service-Learning. *The Generator*, 28.
- Larson, R., Walker, K., and Pearce, N. (2004). A Comparison of Youth-Driven and Adult-Driven Youth Programs: Balancing Inputs from Youth and Adults. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1), 57-74.
- Leming, J. (2001, Spring). Integrating a Structured Ethical Reflection Curriculum into High School Community Service Experiences: Impact on Students' Sociomoral Development. *Adolescence*, 36, 33-45.
- Lepper, M. R. (1988). Motivational Considerations in the Study of Instruction. *Cognition and Instruction*, 5(4), 289-309.
- Lipson, M., Valencia, S., Wixson, K., and Peters, C. (1993). Integration and Thematic Teaching: Integration to Improve Teaching and Learning. *Language Arts*, 70(4), 252-263.
- Markow, D., Martin, S., Comey, G., Zwanziger, E., and Kim, A. (2006). *The National Survey on Service-Learning and Transitioning to Adulthood*. New York: Harris Interactive.
- Martin, S., Neal, M., Kielsmeier, J.C., and Crossley, A. (2006). The Impact of Service-Learning on Transitions to Adulthood. *Growing to Greatness 2006*. St. Paul: National Youth Leadership Council.
- Marzano, R., Pickering, D., and Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McCarthy, E. (2007). The Effectiveness of Service-Learning in After-School Programs. *Growing to Greatness 2007*. St. Paul, MN: National Youth Leadership Council.
- Mitra, D. (2004). The Significance of Students: Can Increasing "Student Voice" in Schools Lead to Gains in Youth Development? *Teachers College Record*, 106(4), 651-688.
- Moore, D. (1981). Discovering the Pedagogy of Experience. *Harvard Educational Review*, 51(2), 286-300.
- Morgan, W., and Streb, M. (2003). First Do No Harm: The Importance of Student Ownership in Service-Learning. *Metropolitan Universities*, 13(3), 321-345.
- National League of Cities. (n.d.). *Promoting Youth Participation*. Washington, DC: National League of Cities.
- National Research Council. (1999). *How People Learn*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. (n.d.). *Building Effective Partnerships in Service-Learning: NSLC Fact Sheet*. Scotts Valley, CA: National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. Available at http://www.servicelearning.org/resources/fact_sheets/k-12_facts/partnerships/.
- National Youth Leadership Council. (2005). Service-Learning Tip Sheet: Diversity. Available at http://www.nylc.org/rc_downloaddetail.cfm?emoid=14:246
- Neill, J.T. (1999, July 8-10). *Personal Development Outcomes of Outdoor Education Programs*. Poster presented at the 11th Australasian Human Development Conference, University of Sydney, Australia. Available at <http://wilderdom.com/abstracts/Neill1999PersonalDevelopmentOutcomesOutdoorEducationPrograms.htm>.
- Oldfather, P. (1995). Songs "Come Back Most to Them": Students' Experiences as Researchers. *Theory into Practice*, 34(2), 131.
- Perry, S., and Albright, E. (1999). *Help at Last: Integrating Reflection into Literacy Instruction*. Denver, CO: RMC Research Corporation.
- Ravitz, J. L., and Becker, H. (n.d.). *When Does Project-Based Teaching Lead to Cognitive Challenge? Data from the TLC 1998 National Survey*. Available at <http://www.crito.uci.edu/tlc/findings/conferences-pdf/autodesk.pdf>.
- RMC Research Corporation. (2003, March). *Reflection: K-12 Service-Learning*. Scotts Valley, CA: National Service-Learning Clearinghouse.
- Root, S., and Billig, S.H. (In press). Service-Learning as a Promising Approach to High School Civic Engagement. In J. Bixby and J. Pace (Eds.), *Educating Democratic Citizens in Troubled Times: Qualitative Studies of Current Efforts*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Root, S., Northup, J., and Turnbull, J. (2007). *Project Citizen Evaluation Report*. Denver, CO: RMC Research Corporation.
- Schunk, D., and Pajares, F. (2002). The Development of Academic Self-Efficacy. In A. Wigfield and J. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of Achievement Motivation* (pp. 16-32). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Secada, W. (1989). *Equity in Education*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Sellers, S.L., Roberts, J., Giovanetto, L., and Friedrich, K. (2005). *Reaching All Students: A Resource for Teaching in Science, Engineering, Technology, & Mathematics*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning, Wisconsin Center for Education Research.
- Shannon, G.S., and Bylsma, P. (2003). *Nine Characteristics of High-Performing Schools*. Olympia, WA: Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- Shumer, R. (1997). Learning from Qualitative Research. In A.S. Waterman (Ed.), *Service-Learning: Applications from the Research* (pp. 25-38). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Simmons, V.C., and Toole, P. (2003, April). Service-Learning Diversity/Equity Project Research Report Executive Summary. *The Generator*, 1-4. Available at http://www.nylc.org/objects/inaction/initiatives/DiveristyEquity/summer03articles/1EDEX_Summary2003.pdf.
- Spring, K., Dietz, N., and Grimm, R. (2006, March). *Educating for Active Citizenship: Service-Learning, School-Based Service and Youth Civic Engagement*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National and Community Service.
- Spring, K., Dietz, N., and Grimm, R. (2006, March). *Youth Helping America: Service-Learning, School-Based Service and Youth Civic Engagement*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National and Community Service.
- Spring, K., Dietz, N. and Grimm, R. (2007). *Leveling the Path to Participation: Volunteering and Civic Engagement among Youth from Disadvantaged Circumstances*. Washington, DC: Corporation for National and Community Service.
- Tennessee Department of Education. (2007). *Success Skills through Service Learning: Standards for High School Courses, Grades 9-12*. Available at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/ci/ciservicestandards/ciserviceframe.htm#Standard2>.
- Toole, J., and Toole, P. (1995). Reflection as a Tool for Turning Service Experiences into Learning Experiences. In C. Kinsley and K. McPherson (Eds.), *Enriching the Curriculum through Service-Learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision Curriculum and Development.
- Vang, K. (2004-2005, Winter). Engaging the Voices from the Rim: Refugees, Immigrants, Migrants, and Service-Learning in Urban Communities. *The Generator*, 21-23.
- Wade, R.C. (1997). *Community Service-Learning: A Guide to Including Service in the Public School Curriculum*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Wang, M., and Stiles, B. (1976). An Investigation of Children's Concept of Self-Responsibility for their School Learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 13, 159.
- Waterman, A. (1993). Conducting Research on Reflective Activities in Service-Learning. In H. Silcox (Ed.), *A How-To Guide to Reflection: Adding Cognitive Learning to Community Service Programs* (pp. 90-99). Philadelphia: Brighton Press.
- Weah, W., Simmons, V., and McClellan, M. (2000). Service-Learning and Multicultural/ Multiethnic Perspectives: From Diversity to Equity. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(9), 673-675.
- Yates, M. (1995). *Community Service and Identity Development in Adolescence*. Dissertation. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America.
- Youth Service California. (2006). *Seven Elements of High Quality Service-Learning*. Available at <http://www.yscal.org/resources/assets/HighQualitySL.doc>.
- Zeldin, S. (2004). Youth as Agents of Adult and Community Development: Mapping the Processes and Outcomes of Youth Engaged in Organizational Governance. *Applied Developmental Science*, 8(2), 75-90.
- Zeldin, S., McDaniel, A., Topitzes, D., and Calvert, M. (2000). *Youth in Decision-Making: A Study on the Impacts of Youth on Adults and Organizations*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Extension, Innovation Center/Tides Center.