



Innovations in International Youth Volunteering

An analysis of 22 innovative youth volunteer programs from around the world

A report by Innovations in Civic Participation (ICP) for v www.wearev.com
January 2008 All rights reserved

Published by v
5th Floor
Dean Bradley House
52 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 2AF

www.wearev.com
January 2008



Table of Contents

Forward	2
Introduction	3
Methodology	4
Overview of selected programs	5
Innovation	8
Replicability	10
Sustainability	11
Conclusion/Recommendations	12
Acknowledgements	13
Appendices:	
A: Cover letter and questionnaire	14
B: Instructions for Expert Panel for scoring criteria and system	19
C: Questions for youth volunteer interviews	22

Foreword

v is an independent charity championing youth volunteering in England. It was launched in May 2006, as a result of the Russell Commission report, with a remit to bring about a step change in the quantity, quality and diversity of youth volunteering. v seeks to inspire a million more young volunteers in England aged 16-25. It has at its heart a Youth Advisory Board, v20, and is led by the cares, interests, passions and beliefs of young people.

To achieve its mission, v recognises the importance of building on existing knowledge and sharing best practice. Hence, we commissioned ICP to conduct this research into innovative youth volunteering projects from around the world, seeking to learn from their most exciting and effective aspects.

The 22 case studies accompanying this report demonstrate that empowering young people – not just the usual suspects, but young people who are themselves marginalised and excluded – is the most important factor for innovation in youth volunteering. With the right support, young volunteers can achieve – and are achieving – real, lasting change within communities.

This is the second in a series of planned research reports, aimed at providing practitioners and policy makers with the information and insights they need to better engage young people in volunteering.

Terry Ryall
v Chief Executive

Introduction

The Innovations in International Youth Volunteering project is an effort to identify and reward innovation in youth volunteering (and particularly youth-led volunteering) from around the world, as well as to analyse these experiences and make recommendations for fostering similar innovation in England and other countries. For the purposes of the project, volunteering is defined as “any activity which involves spending time, unpaid, doing something which aims to benefit other people (other than, or in addition to, close relatives) or to benefit the environment.”¹ These activities can include mutual aid or self-help, service to others, civic engagement, or advocacy and campaigning. We have focused particularly on programs involving youth ages 16 to 25.

The Innovations in Civic Participation (ICP) team and the members of the project Expert Panel have chosen 22 projects to profile in this report out of 134 programs that responded to our call for submissions. These 22 projects represent 17 countries, including three cross-national programs, from Africa, the Middle East, Eastern and Western Europe, Latin America, and South Asia.

In the report that follows, you will find a discussion of the methodology ICP and the Expert Panel used to select the programs and an overview of these programs. Additionally, the report provides an analysis of three critical elements for effective, meaningful and lasting youth volunteering: innovation, replicability and sustainability. The report concludes with recommendations regarding how best to foster and support innovation in youth volunteering in England and around the world. Attached to the report are profiles of the selected programs, which describe the program goals and activities; the elements of innovation; the role of youth in the program, including a profile of a young participant; and the program’s impact and future development.

¹ V Research Specification for project.

Methodology

Because we envisioned this project to be a global, grassroots effort to identify examples of innovation in the youth volunteering field, we distributed the questionnaire (translated into four languages) through a wide variety of contacts, networks and other channels related to youth volunteerism. We received 134 responses, of which we selected 45 to send to the Expert Panel for review. Experts were asked to score each of the programs, which ICP had made anonymous, in the following seven categories: the degree to which the program serves an underserved population; the degree of innovation; the potential to be replicated and adapted; program sustainability; coherence between project objectives and activities; impact; and youth empowerment. Three categories received double weight because of their importance for the study: innovation, replicability, and youth empowerment. Please refer to Appendices A and B for the questionnaires, scoring criteria and instructions for the Expert Panel. We took a combined average of the experts' scores to identify the top programs to be profiled in this report, as well as the programs to receive cash prizes.

The experts identified several areas for potential improvement in the project methodology, should the exercise be replicated in the future. First, in making the programs anonymous, we did not provide experts with the exact locations of the projects (only the regions within countries – or in some cases, just the countries – where they are operating). Some experts felt that this was a mistake, given the importance of knowing the specific local context in which each of the programs operates to evaluate its degree of innovation. Second, the experts felt it would have been helpful to have an initial discussion of the definitions of each of the criteria for program evaluation, given their complexities and subjective nature. Finally, it was agreed that the most appropriate method for selecting the top programs would have been to narrow the best programs to a smaller pool and to identify the top three to four programs through a discussion by the Expert Panel.

The methodology was altered slightly during the scoring process to separate programs that began in 2006-07 from more established ones. This was done to eliminate the ratings for sustainability and impact for promising but unproven programs and to compare the newer programs relative to each other. The top three newer programs are included in this report.

Overview of the selected programs

Following is a list of the 22 selected programs and their respective organisations and countries:

Program	Organisation	Country
Amigos de las Américas	Amigos de las Américas	USA
Arroyo la Tapera	Technical School No. 3, Domingo F. Sarmiento	Argentina
Campo Amigo Ecuador	AYUDA, Inc.	Ecuador/USA
Global Connections and Exchange Program	Relief International-Schools Online	Palestine
Healthy Housing Project	VAMOS BOLIVIA	Bolivia
Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance Training Program for Young People in Institutions of Learning	International Governance Institute	Cameroon
IMPACT	New Horizons	Romania
Make a Connection	Polish Children and Youth Foundation	Poland
ManaTEENS	ManaTEENS	USA
MOMIC	Interdisciplinary Program for Education Research	Chile
Museo Itinerante	Night Primary School for Adolescents and Adults No.102	Argentina
National Sexual Assault Online Hotline	RAINN	USA
National Volunteer Program	Samuhik Abhiyan	Nepal
Never Again Rwanda Human Rights Clubs	Never Again Rwanda	Rwanda
Projeto MetaReciclagem	MetaReciclagem	Brazil
Residencia Universitaria: Jóvenes Solidarios	Residencia Universitaria: Jóvenes Solidarios	El Salvador
Say No to Sexual Abuse	Centre for Alternatives for Victimised Women and Children	Malawi
School Girls Unite	Youth Activism Project	Mali/USA
Selo Escola Solidária	Faça Parte	Brazil
Starting Line	Chinese Progressive Association	USA
Unis-Cité	Unis-Cité	France
Young Philanthropists	Young Philanthropists	Kenya

There was a wide variety in the types of selected programs:

- **Full-time national youth service programs:** National Volunteer Program (Nepal) and Unis-Cité (France)
- **International volunteering:** Amigos de las Américas and Campo Amigo Ecuador
- **Re-granting program:** Make a Connection project
- **Service-learning projects:** Arroyo la Tapera, Global Connections and Exchange Program, Museo Itinerante, Jovenes Solidarios, and Selo Escola Solidária
- **Multifaceted community volunteering programs:** ManaTEENS (with service-learning component), IMPACT, and MOMIC
- **Advocacy/campaigning programs:** Never Again Rwanda; Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance Training Program for Young People in Institutions of Learning; School Girls Unite; Say No to Sexual Abuse.
- **Volunteering around targeted issues:** Healthy Housing Project (housing and public health), Starting Line (immigration), MetaReciclagem (environment and technology), National Sexual Assault Online Hotline (sexual assault), Young Philanthropists (public health).

There was also a wide variety in the kinds of organisations or groups leading and/or sponsoring the programs:

Government programs:

Healthy Housing Project, although the project is run by an NGO (VAMOS BOLIVIA)

NGO programs:

- Amigos de las Américas
- Say No to Sexual Abuse
- Selo Escola Solidária
- Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance Training Program for Young People in Institutions of Learning
- MOMIC
- National Volunteer Program Nepal (**with close ties to government**)
- Never Again Rwanda
- IMPACT
- National Sexual Assault Online Hotline
- Make a Connection
- Projecto MetaReciclagem
- Global Connections & Exchange Program
- School Girls Unite (**largely youth initiated**)
- Starting Line (**youth initiated**)
- Unis-Cité (**youth initiated**)
- ManaTEENS (**youth initiated**)
- Campo Amigo Ecuador (**youth initiated**)

Programs affiliated with schools/universities:

- Proyecto Arroyo La Tapera
- Jóvenes Solidarios (**youth initiated**)
- Museo Itinerante

Informal youth organisation:

- Young Philanthropists

The annual program budgets range from USD\$4.5 million (Unis-Cité) to the Young Philanthropists program budget of USD\$2,500.

The most established program is Amigos de las Américas, which began in 1965. The newest programs are the Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance Training Program for Young People in Institutions of Learning, the Young Philanthropists, and the National Sexual Assault Online Hotline, which all began in 2006.

The program with the largest annual number of participants is ManaTEENS, with 6,778 youth volunteers in 2006 alone. The smallest is Starting Line, with 10 volunteer mentors last year.

One of the key findings of this research is that there is no single definition of innovation in youth volunteering and that innovation must be considered relative to local context. A definition of innovation from a business perspective is a “change that adds value,”² but what is value added in terms of youth volunteer programs and how does value vary according to different stakeholders and local contexts? Additionally, when considering innovation in youth volunteer programs, the analysis must be disaggregated to consider the program’s (1) purpose, (2) form, and (3) outputs/outcomes. Regardless of how innovative a project idea is or the form the volunteer activity takes, the program must generate a real impact on both the community and the youth participants. Despite the complexities of defining innovation in youth volunteering, it is possible to distil some commonalities among the selected programs:

Deliberate: Innovation doesn’t happen by accident; innovative programs go out of their way to involve all stakeholders and to utilise all available resources to generate and apply new ideas.

Flexible: Many innovative programs have simple, flexible structures, such as the youth club models profiled in this report, which allow programs to be tailored to specific contexts and needs. The National Sexual Assault Online Hotline’s use of on-line technology also allows youth to participate at their convenience and from any location.

Innovative programs identify a **new problem** or a **new approach** to an old problem. They also involve youth and the community at large in this process.

Innovative programs **mobilise more than the “usual suspects.”** They find innovative ways to empower youth who are themselves marginalised or socially excluded because of disabilities or socio-economic factors. Campo Amigo Ecuador is an example of a program that empowers youth with diabetes; MOMIC selects “leaders” among groups of youth in Santiago’s most marginalised neighbourhoods. These are also examples of ways in which innovative youth volunteer programs **serve underserved populations.**

Innovative youth volunteer programs have **mechanisms for facilitating genuine youth empowerment** – for recognising and supporting the capacities and passions of young people. As Temesi Mukani from Young Philanthropists said, “This is a youth solution to a youth problem.” This element of innovation often requires generating a major cultural shift in the way that both adults and young people themselves perceive youth’s role in society, the value of youth empowerment, and the nature and potential of volunteerism. Many of the profiled programs that are successful in facilitating youth empowerment also create different roles for youth during several project phases and over the course of their participation in the program (from volunteers, to volunteer coordinators, to project directors, to alumni board members, for example).

² Allan Ryan and Dr. John Jackson, “Managing Innovation in Organisations: Processes, Indicators and GSS Implementation.” http://www.knowledgcreationpress.com/conference/TT21C_Ryan.pdf

Creative partnerships, funding structures and sources: An example of innovation in this area among the profiled projects is MOMIC's development of partnerships with local and national government bodies, NGOs and private companies. And, for example, Jovenes Solidarios has raised funds among the Salvadorian Diaspora community in the US. Campo Amigo Ecuador asks US volunteers to raise money before training.

Innovative youth volunteer programs **tap into the pulse of today's youth culture**. They involve the use of new technologies (Schools On-Line or the National Sexual Assault Hotline are good examples) and encourage society and youth to view technology in new ways as well as to experiment and play with technology (Proyecto MetaReciclagem, for example).

Innovative incentive structures and ways to mobilise youth volunteers were also common among the projects profiled. One example is IMPACT's combination of service projects with outdoor education.

Innovative projects also **combined different kinds of volunteering**, from community service, to lobbying/campaigning, to service-learning. The selected programs also often created intentional learning feedback loops or **elements of reflection** that are integral to service-learning pedagogy (but not restricted to projects denominated as "service-learning" alone).

Finally, many of the selected programs **defined borders or boundaries in new ways and promoted linkages across these boundaries** (from Mali to the US, for example, or from different neighbourhoods within New York City and from new Chinese immigrants to more established ones).

Replicability

Replicability can generally be defined as those program elements that can be transferred from the program's current setting to other contexts. As with innovation, when analysing a youth volunteer program's potential for replicability, it is important to distinguish among the different programmatic elements, including purpose, form, and outputs/outcomes. For example, a program whose purpose might be particularly relevant for England is Starting Line, since the integration of recent immigrants into society is as important in the UK as it is in the US. On the other hand, while the issue the Young Philanthropists program is addressing is not relevant in England (the lack of sanitary napkins), the way in which this need was identified by youth and turned into youth-led programming, for example, could be replicated.

When thinking about replicability, it is important to boil programs down to their essence to extract their most effective and exciting aspects, rather than attempting to duplicate them exactly. For example, School Girls Unite can be conceptualised as a program to create a cultural bridge between young people belonging to different worlds. In the context of England and the changing nature of Europe under the European Union, what new borders are forming and what bridges will need to be established? How could a volunteer program such as School Girls Unite be replicated in these environments?

It is interesting to note that several of the selected programs are making conscious efforts to facilitate replication by sharing methodologies, project histories and curricula on-line (examples include Selo Escola Solidária, ManaTEENS, and the Global Connections & Exchange Program). Also, several of the projects have already been replicated or are part of a larger network (Global Connections & Exchange Program, Never Again Rwanda, and Jovenes Solidarios, for example). Unis-Cité and Campo Amigo Ecuador are based on existing models (the City Year program in the US in the case of Unis-Cité and a diabetes camp in the US in the case of Campo Amigo Ecuador); however, each program has adapted the model to its local context. Attempts to create new programs or to replicate existing programs should focus on drawing from these lessons and seek to create partnerships and exchanges as possible to draw on this wealth of information.

In considering the particular context of the UK, the Expert Panel distilled several recommendations from the program profiles about programmatic elements that might be replicated and could add value to youth volunteerism in England:

- Emphasising the generation of team volunteering activities rather than individual ones;
- Taking a youth action approach by viewing youth as catalysts for engaging other youth;
- Using community service programs (in addition to campaigning organisations) to focus on big social issues such as homelessness, poverty, or inequality; and
- Creating effective partnerships between non-profits and governmental bodies around volunteering initiatives.

Sustainability

As with innovation, the project revealed that sustainability of a youth volunteer program is very closely related to the particular context in which it is operating. This context may include the political and economic structures of countries as well as government support for volunteer activities and civil society more generally. Sustainability also relates to the economic situations and vulnerability of young volunteers themselves and the ability of programs to adapt to these realities. It is also important to distinguish between the sustainability of a program and the sustainability of a program's impacts.

Several factors that influence the sustainability of youth volunteer programs include:

- The ability to develop partnerships with diverse stakeholders and to maintain these relationships over time, adapting them to different programmatic needs at different project stages. University and school partnerships, as well as relationships with past volunteers, were common elements among selected programs. It is interesting to note, however, that few programs seemed to engage the corporate sector in a profound and lasting way, with Unis-Cité, MOMIC and Projeto MetaReciclagem forming notable exceptions, for example. Additional emphasis on these relations would significantly strengthen not only the sustainability of many programs, but also their scope, societal recognition, and quality.
- The timeliness and relevance of the issues addressed, as well as the ability to evaluate the program's relevance on a regular basis and to adapt the program activities accordingly.
- Involving program participants in fundraising as a way to mobilise resources and to foster the commitment and engagement of participants.
- The overall competence and capacity for effective management of program leaders and the ability of programs to generate new leaders.

Overall, establishing youth buy-in to the program and maintaining this level of commitment seems to be one of the most important factors for program sustainability.

Conclusion & Recommendations

As highlighted in this report and demonstrated by the following program profiles, there is no formula or recipe for generating, sustaining or replicating innovation and quality in youth volunteering. Volunteer programs are inextricable from their contexts; however, we have tried to identify some good practices and common elements from among the selected programs to spur further thought and discussion on the subject of innovation in youth volunteering. Potentially the most important factor for innovation in youth volunteering is youth empowerment, so we encourage volunteer program managers, policymakers and youth to identify the ways in which young people can be given the space and additional tools they need to fully realise their potential. These additional tools might include training in both specific program management as well as broader life skills; grants to support innovation, replicability and sustainability, including low-cost, flexible youth volunteer models (such as youth clubs); and public awareness building to overcome societal barriers in relation to perceptions of youth and volunteering. As the 22 Innovative Youth Volunteer Programmes demonstrate, young volunteers are asking the right questions and identifying solutions for many of the most pressing global problems. We just have to learn how to listen and be inspired to support them.

Acknowledgements

Under the leadership of Susan Stroud, Executive Director of ICP, the staff members who contributed to this report include Katherine Hutter, Charlotte McDowell, Rose McGovern, Emma Lochery, Lily Axelrod, Sejal Jhaveri, Adeola Olagunju and Lisbeth Shepherd. Each applied a great deal of motivation and creative thinking to the project. ICP would also particularly like to thank the members of the Expert Panel whose insight and dedication were invaluable: Nieves Tapia and Enrique Ochoa of CLAYSS in Argentina; Helene Perold and Rejoice Shumba of VOSESA in South Africa; Richard Beattie, formerly with CIDA and now an independent consultant in Canada; Arnie Wickens of CSV in England; and Cyprien Semushi of YADDI in Rwanda. Their knowledge and love of the youth volunteering field are commendable. Additionally, ICP would like to thank you for recognising and supporting the need to research and analyse innovation in youth volunteering on an international level.

Finally, we offer a heartfelt thanks to the project managers and youth volunteers who provided us with additional materials and perspectives on the projects. Their work speaks for itself, and it is our pleasure to share their experiences and insights with others. This initiative has already begun to generate fruitful dialogue among projects and members of the Expert Panel, and the release of this report is sure to inspire further innovation in youth volunteering in England and many other countries around the world.

Appendix A

Innovation in International Youth Volunteering Questionnaire

General Program Information

Please note that this research project is focusing on volunteer programs involving youth aged 16 to 25, as stated in the cover letter.

Program name:

Program contact information, including organisation or program website if available:

Name, title (or relationship to the program) and contact information of person responding to this questionnaire:

Type and scope of volunteer program (please check all options that apply):

- Community service (main goal of the activity is service to a community, including working with an individual or group of individuals within a particular community)
- Service-learning (goals are service to the community and educational – formal or non-formal – for youth providing service)
- Advocacy/campaigning (groups of volunteers lobbying for change)
- Mutual aid/self-help (distinction between beneficiary and volunteer may be less clear)
- Other (If “other,” please describe)

- Episodic (anything less than “part-time” as defined below)
- Part-time (participants engage in the program 2 hours per week or more, every week)
- Full-time (for example, participation in national youth service schemes)

- Local
- National
- International

- If full-time national service or service-learning program, is participation mandatory for a certain target population?

Kind of organisation or group leading and/or sponsoring the program
(please check all options that apply):

- Local or national government agency
- International non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Faith-based NGO
- Non faith-based NGO
- Community-based informal organisation
- Business or corporation
- School or higher education institution
- Organised youth group/association
- Non-formal youth group/movement
- Individual youth(s)
- Other (If "other," please describe)

Program goals/foci, including goals for program participants
(list up to five):

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Number and age ranges of program staff, if applicable:

In which year was the program started:

Geographic area(s) where program operates:

Length of program available or offered to volunteers:

Average length of time youth actually participate in the program:

Current annual program budget in USD, if applicable (please list the budget for the program being described, not for the organisation running the program):

Characteristics of participant population last year (2006):

a. Age

b. Gender

c. Socio-economic situation

d. Geographic location

e. Educational status

Average participant characteristics since inception of the program, if known:

a. Age

b. Gender

c. Socio-economic situation

d. Geographic location

e. Educational status

Total number of participants last year (2006)
(please estimate, if necessary):

Total number of participants since inception of the program, if known:

Please respond to each of the following six questions, limiting your responses to the specified number of words.

1. Description of specific program activities (up to 200 words).
2. Description of role young people play in the program (up to 100 words).
3. Main outcomes or impacts of the program to date and description of how these outcomes have been measured (up to 150 words).

4. Description of
 - (a) key successes, and
 - (b) main challenges for the program, as well as
 - (c) potential ways to improve the program
(up to 150 words total for 4a-c).

5. For this question, please address the following three sub-questions. Your combined response to questions 5a-c should be no longer than 200 words.
 - 5(a) Which social issues is the volunteer program addressing?

 - 5(b) How are young people involved in addressing these issues, and what impact has their involvement had both on the issues themselves and on the young people's perceptions and understanding of the issues?

 - 5(c) How does the program help young people reflect on these social issues and their role in addressing them?

6. For this question, please reflect on the following three sub-questions relating to innovation in youth volunteering:
 - 6(a) What characterises an innovative volunteer program in your opinion?

 - 6(b) Why do you believe the program you have described in this questionnaire is innovative?

 - 6(c) How has this program achieved these innovations?

Please limit your combined response to questions 6a-c to 500 words. For this response, you may consider reflecting on the following program elements; however, please feel free to discuss other elements or topics not listed below. We are looking for an in-depth narrative response to this question, rather than yes/no answers.

- Participant targeting, recruiting and incentive structures
- Participant training and opportunities for continuous learning
- Teamwork and leadership opportunities and inspiration for youth-led action
- Fostering knowledge, values and life skills development among participants
- Promotion of livelihood / employability skills and knowledge
- Identifying and meeting critical individual, community and national needs
- Stakeholder engagement and partnership development

- Funding structures and sources
- Scalability, replicability, and sustainability
- Visibility and awareness campaigns (for the program as well as for the youth and social issues the program is addressing)
- Program design, implementation and evaluation, and particularly youth-involvement in this process
- Use of technology or media

The team at Innovations in Civic Participation very much appreciates your participation in this important research project.

Appendix B

Instructions for Expert Panel for Scoring Criteria and System

We have sent you anonymous versions of the pre-screened questionnaires. All have been translated into English; however, the translations may be somewhat rough. In general, we encourage you NOT to rate programs based on the presentation of the information or the quality of the writing. Each program has a corresponding number, which ICP is using to identify and track them.

Instructions for Excel sheet

Please be sure to enter your name where indicated on the Excel sheet. We will take an average of each of your overall project scores and select the top 20-30 programs to be profiled as case studies. Additionally, the top 3 programs will receive cash awards. As you will see on the Excel sheet, we have assigned double weight for 3 categories: innovation, replicability/adaptability and youth empowerment. In the comments/notes section, please indicate if there are any questions that should be clarified or expanded with program managers when we conduct interviews for the case studies. You may also include other comments/notes on each of the programs either in the Excel document or in a separate Word document, should you find this helpful (not required).

When assigning scores for each of the categories, please consider the following programmatic elements, as appropriate:

- Program activities
- Program design, implementation and evaluation, and particularly youth-involvement in this process
- Participant targeting, recruiting and incentive structures
- Participant training and opportunities for continuous learning
- Teamwork and leadership opportunities and inspiration for youth-led action
- Fostering knowledge, values and life skills development among participants
- Promotion of livelihood / employability skills and knowledge
- Stakeholder engagement and partnership development
- Funding structures and sources
- Visibility and awareness campaigns (for the program as well as for the youth and social issues the program is addressing)
- Use of technology or media

Categories

Please rate each of the following categories according to 4 being the highest score and 1 being the lowest score.

- **Extent to which program serves an underserved population**

(either the beneficiaries or the volunteers)

[By “underserved population,” we are referring to characteristics such as gender, socioeconomic situation and geographic location, for example.]

4: To a great extent; 3: To a medium extent; 2: To some extent

1: Not at all

- **Innovation**

[Please consider innovation in relation to the list of programmatic elements we included above. In general, programs may be innovative in terms of their approach, methodology, focus, involvement of youth, and a variety of other factors. You should try to consider innovation relative to the local context of the program as well as to the program’s budget, for example. Please use your best judgment on this; we recognise that ranking innovation may tend to be subjective, but we have chosen members of the expert panel who represent a variety of geographic and programmatic backgrounds precisely for this reason.]

4: Very innovative; 3: Innovative; 2: Somewhat innovative;

1: Not innovative

- **Adaptability/replicability for the UK and elsewhere**

[Please use your best judgment on this. Do keep in mind, however, that while the program in general may not seem very adaptable, elements of it may be. For example, while the social issue the volunteer program is addressing may not be pertinent for the British context, the program methodology may be highly adaptable. This issue will be one of the main foci for the discussion we will have on June 22 – particularly, how innovation and adaptability/replicability relate to one another, for example.]

4: Highly adaptable/replicable; 3: Adaptable/replicable;

2: Somewhat adaptable/replicable; 1: Not adaptable/replicable

- **Sustainability**

[Consider particularly program growth, partnerships, and funding structures and sources.]

4: Highly sustainable; 3: Sustainable; 2: Somewhat sustainable;

1: Not sustainable

- **Coherence**

[For example, do program activities reflect program goals?]

4: Very coherent; 3: Coherent; 2: Somewhat coherent;

1: Not coherent

- **Impact**

[On critical community or national needs/social issues as well as on volunteers themselves, taking into account reliability of data, if known. Your score should reflect both the quality and quantity of impact.]

4: High impact; 3: Med. impact; 2: Low impact; 1: No impact

- **Extent to which the program empowers youth**

(gives youth sufficient voice, responsibility and decision-making authority):

- In the design, management and evaluation of the program
- To identify and address critical community needs/social issues (both those the volunteer activity is addressing and others)

4: To a great extent; 3: To a medium extent; 2: To some extent; 1: Not at all

Instructions for Word document

In addition to filling out the attached Excel spreadsheet, we would greatly appreciate it if you could submit your overall thoughts and reactions to the submissions and review process in a single Word document. These reflections will be very helpful for our call on June 22 when we have our final discussion about the project and case studies. Please submit this Word document with the Excel sheet. We don't expect this document to be more than a few pages.

Some questions to consider for reflection might include:

- What were the key enabling factors for program innovation, replicability/adaptability, effectiveness/impact, and sustainability, and how did these categories relate to each other? What factors seemed to hinder these elements? You might consider factors such as:
 - The type of volunteer program
 - Kind of organisation/group leading and/or sponsoring the program
 - Youth involvement in the program
 - Budget
 - Geography/scope of activities
 - Size of program
 - Newness of program
 - Funding sources and structures
 - Cultural/political context
- Similarities/differences among the programs (social issues addressed, successes/challenges, etc.)
- Key factors that seem to make the programs attractive to young volunteers (This is one of the questions we will be asking the volunteers during the interview stage, but it may also be evident from some of the questionnaire responses.)
- How programs have identified and responded to social issues/needs, as well as the needs of the volunteer participants themselves

Appendix C

Youth Volunteer Questions

Before the interview, inform them that you will be tape recording the interview.

1. Background

What is your name?

How old are you?

What is the best way to contact you should we need to follow up in the future?

How long have you been participating in the program?

Tell us about yourself.

What are your future plans? (This question should be altered as needed.)

What do you do in this program?

What is your role?

2. What attracted them to volunteer in this program?

How did you hear about this program?

How/Why did you get involved in this program?

If you wanted to get someone involved in this program, what would you tell them?

Do you encourage your friends or family to participate? Why?

What are your future volunteering plans? Are you going to volunteer in this program next year?

What was the hardest part of the program? How did you face this challenge?

3. What is Innovative?

What surprised you about this program or your volunteer work through this program?

What have you learned through this program?

How are you helping your community through this program?

Do you see your community or issues facing the community differently after participating in this program? (Try to get at any social issues they have dealt with and how they feel about those issues after the program.)

How does the community view the program?

What is special or exciting about this program?

4. How were they engaged as leaders in the program? What was the youth role in this program?

How did you decide what you were going to do in the program?

Have you made any suggestions for program improvement?

What has been the result?

Do you think you have developed leadership skills through this program? What other skills have you developed through this program?

5. Memorable Experience (These questions are important so please make sure you get to them)

Give an example of a rewarding experience in this program.

Has this program impacted your life? If so, how has this program impacted your life?